



**LOUISIANA**

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

**FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN**

**JULY 1, 2008 – JUNE 30, 2013**

**June 27, 2007**

## Table of Contents

Vision, Mission, & Values.....	3
Departmental Goals.....	4
DOTD-Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats.....	5
Strategic Plan.....	7
Appendix A: Vision 2020 Link.....	60
Appendix B: Principal Clients.....	67
Appendix C: External Factors.....	73
Appendix D: Duplication of Efforts.....	79
Appendix E: Performance Indicator Documentation.....	84
Appendix F: Strategy Analysis Checklist.....	235

## Vision, Mission, & Values

### Vision

To be a leader moving Louisiana forward

### Mission

To deliver transportation and public works systems that enhances quality of life and facilitates economic growth and recovery.

### Values

We are committed to earning the public's trust, holding to the highest moral, ethical, and professional standards.

### People

We respect our coworkers for their dedication, skills, diversity, and responsible actions.

### Excellence

We strive for high quality, ensuring the best product possible in a timely manner.

### Leadership

We embrace our responsibilities and empower our people to succeed.

### Public Service

We respond to the needs of our citizens, communities, and partners in a timely manner.

### Accountability

We take responsibility for our performance.

### Departmental Goals

Continually improve the performance of DOTD.

Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.

Improve customer service and public confidence.

Effectively develop and manage our human resources.

Efficiently manage DOTD's financial resources.

## **Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats**

The Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development perceives its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to be vital components in effectively negotiating the future direction of the agency. The specific factors relative to this strategy include the following:

### **Strengths:**

Identification of agency strengths allows DOTD to maximize its understanding of available tools so that it may create effective and viable operational and strategic plans.

- Committed employees.
- Strong relationships with executive and legislative branches of government.
- A structured training program that is designed to prepare employees for advancement.
- Culture of change and continuous performance improvement.

### **Weaknesses**

Recognition of agency weaknesses affords DOTD an opportunity to adequately prepare for program and planning initiatives as well as to prepare for potential risks that may result from agency vulnerabilities.

- Lack of necessary equipment throughout agency or in specific sections or districts.
- Key decision makers (e.g., Legislators, governing bodies, etc.) may not always be fully aware of the needs or fully consider implications of their decisions.
- Programs/districts/sections have been assigned additional tasks and responsibilities with insufficient Table of Organization (TO) to handle these duties.
- Programs or units within the agency have the tendency to operate in silos which inhibits the information flow throughout the Department.

## **Opportunities**

DOTD has several areas of opportunity in terms of funding sources and its ability to improve the transportation infrastructure throughout the state.

- A workforce committed to the betterment of Louisiana's programs.
- A strong partnership with Louisiana State Police and the Highway Safety Commission to reduce fatality rates and increase highway safety.
- A history of successful programs which are publicized and leveraged for public support.
- A strong partnership with industry.
- A strong partnership with the Department of Economic Development, Department of Natural Resources, Civil Service, local governments, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs).

## **Threats**

LA DOTD perceives threats – both internal and external – as any factors that will impede its efforts to meet mandates, statutes, and regulations, and elevate its level of service. By recognizing and identifying these threats, DOTD can be aware of the complete operational consequences and anticipate future impacts.

- Difficulty in attracting and retaining qualified employees.
- Some sections/districts/programs are understaffed relative to the functions they provide.
- The high number of employees eligible for retirement in upper and middle level management without adequately prepared successors, i.e., no bench strength.
- Lack of a knowledge management system to capture and archive standard operating procedures, decision-making processes, procedures for infrequent tasks, and the evolution of the organizational culture and work processes.
- Inability to meet strategic objectives due to funding.
- Rising construction costs exceeding the rate of inflation.
- Continuation of Federal funding in jeopardy.
- Adequate funding to maintain and/or reach public's desired level of service.

- Tort liability.

## 1. ADMINISTRATION

### 1.1. OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

**Authorized Positions:** (29)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 36:504

**Mission:** To provide leadership, direction, and accountability for all DOTD programs in support of its mission

**Program Description:** Responsible for the overall direction and policy setting of the department.

**Goal:** Provide administrative direction and leadership, which will ensure that subordinate DOTD programs are managed to provide the optimum benefits and services to the public within the constraints of available funding and applicable regulations.

1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

1.1.1.1. Establish, disseminate, and implement agency communication plan to improve customer satisfaction.

- 1.1.1.1.1. Public Affairs Office will formalize communications plan/strategy in brochure format and distribute to all employees.
- 1.1.1.1.2. Keep travelers informed of road work.
- 1.1.1.1.3. Enhance and improve website by implementing and regularly maintaining one travel map showing road construction, traffic congestion, and accidents/incidents on any given route.
- 1.1.1.1.4. Increase timeliness, frequency, and quality of media interactions through trained district media liaisons.
- 1.1.1.1.5. Increase usage of “on the road” travel information like dynamic message boards, MAP’s, 511, toll-free district telephone numbers, maps in rest areas, etc.
- 1.1.1.1.6. Better inform community members and organizations about highway projects by generating more interest in public meetings, fostering realistic customer expectations in line with resources, developing public information plans prior to start-up of construction projects and utilizing existing marketing materials like 511, Intelligent Transportation System, etc.
- 1.1.1.1.7. Deliver consistent messages by establishing a speaker’s bureau, developing and providing access to key messages/PowerPoint presentations, soliciting speaking engagements, responding to negative coverage via letters/follow-ups with reporters.
- 1.1.1.1.8. Make information easily/readily available by investigating automated email notifications, responding to media requests in a professional/timely manner and establishing a web media room with press releases, project/program information and photographs, etc.
- 1.1.1.1.9. Proactively inform the media of agency success stories, project status, project performance, and community efforts.



- 1.1.1.1.10. Provide elected officials with advanced notice of projects, project status reports, conduct ground-breaking and ribbon-cutting ceremonies to share credit, publicize accomplishments through Annual Reports, quarterly performance indicator reports, report cards, Commuter Lines, new releases, etc.
- 1.1.1.1.11. Enhance internal communications by keeping employees informed of project/Secretary's messages via Intranet memos, interactive television monitors, or events boards, publicize projects/policies in newsletters and staff meetings. Keep key officials up to date through newspaper articles and national issues via the Internet.
- 1.1.1.1.12. Increase customer-focus awareness by emphasizing the following in newsletters and staff meetings: providing telephone skills/customer service training, responding to customer inquiries within three working days, establishing FAQ's on website, distributing fact sheets on popular topics like ITS, setting speed limits/installing traffic signals, designating school zones, KEY facts about DOTD, and developing brochures and marketing campaigns for special projects/programs.
- 1.1.1.1.13. Create State Quality Partnership.
  - 1.1.1.1.13.1. Determine level and effectiveness of relationships with FHWA, MPOs, and other state agencies, etc., and establish and deploy means of improvement.
- 1.1.1.1.14. Improve business transactions on website.
- 1.1.1.1.15. Improve user-friendliness of business pages (truck permits, publications, bid letting, etc.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Improve customer service and public confidence.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 1.1.1: Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Target of 5 formal communication programs.	Number of formal communication programs initiated.	Number of formal communication programs initiated divided by 5		.

## 1.2. OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE

**Authorized Positions:** (253)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 36:501

**Program Description:** Provides department-wide support through its sections and programs including financial services, audit, budget, business services, facilities, procurement, project finance, quality and continuous improvement, and other management services.

**Mission:** To support the mission of DOTD by providing services that enables the success of all DOTD agencies, offices, and programs.

**Goals:**

- Continually improve the performance of DOTD
- Deliver Management & Finance products, projects & services in an efficient manner
- Improve customer service and public confidence
- Effectively develop and manage our human resources
- Efficiently and effectively manage DOTD's financial resources

1.2.1. Objective: Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 1.2.1.1. Provide management with tools/systems to attract a qualified and diverse pool of applicants.
- 1.2.1.2. Establish HR programs/policies to motivate employees to achieve high performance levels.
- 1.2.1.3. Provide training opportunities that are specifically directed to improving the skill level.
- 1.2.1.4. Implement a workforce succession plan.
- 1.2.1.5. Increase the number of internships available for engineering students.
- 1.2.1.6. Partner with local colleges and universities for co-op students and/or interns in disciplines other than engineering, i.e., accountants, auditors, human resources, computer science.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Effectively develop and manage our human resources.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 1.2.1: Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Average number of vacant positions.	Number of positions filled.	Reduction in vacancy rate.	Number of positions filled over number of vacant positions.	
	Total number of approved positions.				

1.2.2. Objective: To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.

Strategies:

1.2.2.1. Identify opportunities for cost-effective reductions of administrative expenses.

1.2.2.1.1. Analyze the administrative expenses within each Division.

1.2.2.1.2. Identify positions that can be eliminated or consolidated.

1.2.2.1.3. Analyze supply and travel budgets that are counted as administrative expenses.

1.2.2.1.4. Analyze consultant contracts that are counted as administrative expenses.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Efficiently manage DOTD's financial resources.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 1.2.2: To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.	Budgeted construction funds.	Actual administrative expenditures.	Administrative expenditures divided by total of construction and maintenance expenditures multiplied by 100=percent administrative expenditures		
	Budgeted maintenance funds.	Actual construction expenditures.			
		Actual maintenance expenditures.			

## 2. PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, & INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION

### 2.1. WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION

**Authorized Positions:** (63)

**Program Authorization:** Directive of the Governor, Louisiana Revised Statutes Title 38: § L.R.S. 38:2; § L.R.S. 36:508; § L.R.S. 41:51; § L.R.S. 38:21–38:28; § L.R.S. 38:281–38:513; § L.R.S. 38:90.1-38:90.16; § L.R.S. 34:3451–34:3463; § L.R.S. 38:5; § L.R.S. 38:3094; § L.R.S. 38:30–38:34; § L.R.S. 38:3091.1; § L.R.S. 38:2226; § L.R.S. 38:3098–3898.8; § L.R.S. 38:3096(C); § L.R.S. 38:3091.8; § L.R.S. 38:1–38:19; § L.R.S. 38:508–38:509; § L.R.S. 38:90.4(A)(B)(C); § L.R.S. 38:91; PL 566, Section 60.25 of CRF 44, PL 104–303, R.S. 38:241-248, R.S. 38:501, R.S. 38:502, R. S. 49:213

**Program Description:** This program plans, develops, and manages the State’s flood control, maritime infrastructure, ground and surface water resources in order to provide existing, and future, human and economic development needs. Additionally, the program identifies the needs and priorities for flood control and rail infrastructure and administers capital improvement projects.

**Mission:** The mission of this program is twofold:

1. Public Works and Hurricane Flood Protection: To develop the full potential of Louisiana’s water-related resources by administering programs implementing infrastructure projects relating to controlling, developing, conserving, and protecting all aspects of the resources including water supply, drainage, flood control, maritime, and port infrastructure.
2. Intermodal Transportation: To continually improve Louisiana’s Marine and Rail systems to provide an efficient, safe, and seamless Intermodal architecture to nurture economic development and enhance the quality of life.

**Goals:**

Continuously improve the performance of the Office of Public Works, Hurricane Flood Protection & Intermodal Transportation

Deliver cost effective products, projects and services in a timely manner for all the office’s programs.

Improve customer service and public confidence in the office’s programs

Effectively develop and manage our human resources

Efficiently manage the office’s financial resources

2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to ensure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

2.1.1.1. Use state funds as cost share for Port Construction and Development Priority Program projects that will provide to the state at least five times the state's investment.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix					
Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.						
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 2.1.1: To conduct the State’s maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state’s investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.	State’s share of construction expenditures.	Total benefits.	State’s return on investment (ROI).			

2.1.2. Objective: Optimize the State's flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 2.1.2.1. Use state funds as cost share match for Federal Corps of Engineers flood control projects that will provide at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits.
- 2.1.2.2. Use state funds as cost share for statewide flood control projects that will provide at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits.
- 2.1.2.3. Use state funds as cost share for Hurricane Priority Program projects that will provide at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix					
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.					
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 2.1.2: Optimize the State’s flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state’s investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.	All flood control program expenditures.	Total benefits.	State’s return on investment (ROI).			

2.1.3. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

2.1.3. Promote activities and projects eligible for CRS.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 2.1.3: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.	Number of flood insurance policyholders	Flood insurance policyholders receiving insurance rate reductions	Percentage of policyholders receiving insurance rate reductions.		



2.1.4. Objective: Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 2.1.4.1. Perform hurricane flood protection system assessment inspections (levees, floodwalls, pump stations, and drainage structures).
  - 2.1.4.1.1. Ensure that levee inspection schedule and requirements are met.
  - 2.1.4.1.2. Ensure that a plan of action to correct deficiencies noted during the assessment has been submitted and followed.
  - 2.1.4.1.3. Ensure each protection system owner/operator maintains and follows his/her emergency action plan for hurricane response.
- 2.1.4.2. Perform the scheduled dam safety inspections.
  - 2.1.4.2.1. Advise each owner of the status of his/her dam's safety, deficiencies noted, and the required corrective action.
  - 2.1.4.2.2. Ensure all FEMA certifications are met.
  - 2.1.4.2.3. Prepare and/or update emergency action plans (EAP) for each of the state maintained dams.
- 2.1.4.3. Perform the required water well inspections.
  - 2.1.4.3.1. Validate data submitted on water well registration forms.
  - 2.1.4.3.2. Strive to achieve 100% compliance with the state's water well construction standards.
  - 2.1.4.3.3. Track water well inspection process.
  - 2.1.4.3.4. Advise drillers of deficiencies.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 2.1.4: Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Number of levee districts having hurricane protection systems that require assessments.	Actual number of completed assessments for levee districts having hurricane protection systems.	Percentage of required levee district assessments completed.	Percentage of all water resource infrastructure conditions and serviceability assessments completed.	Number of levee districts with an overall hurricane inspection system rating of Good, Very Good, or Excellent.
	Number of new registered water wells in the state.	Number of new registered water wells that meet construction standards.	Percentage of new registered water wells that meet construction standards.		
	Actual number of dams scheduled for inspection per year.	Actual number of dams inspected per year.	Percentage of dam safety inspections on schedule.		

- 2.1.5. Objective: Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 2.1.5.1. Assess the needs and determine the priorities for improving Louisiana's navigable waterways system by December 31 of each year.
  - 2.1.5.1.1. Continuously collect and maintain data on Louisiana's navigable waterways.
  - 2.1.5.1.2. Maintain close cooperation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and other stakeholders to identify new areas needing improvement.
  - 2.1.5.1.3. Coordinate with the Corps, Coast Guard, and MARAD on programs that stimulate economic growth through inland waterway improvements.
- 2.1.5.2. Identify sources of state funding for waterways projects and submit appropriate legislation by March 31, 2009.
- 2.1.5.3. Seek funding for projects of importance to Louisiana by March 31 of each year.
  - 2.1.5.3.1. Submit Capital Outlay Requests for state matching funds for Corps projects.
  - 2.1.5.3.2. Submit funding requests with Louisiana's Congressional Delegation for projects that benefit Louisiana.
  - 2.1.5.3.3. Support the Corps' budget in Congress for executing projects in Louisiana.
- 2.1.5.4. Partner with the Corps, port authorities, MPOs, and other stakeholders to complete navigation projects.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 2.1.5: Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	Needed improvements identified.	Number of navigation projects initiated in Louisiana.	Number of navigation projects completed in Louisiana.		

- 2.1.6. Objective: Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 2.1.6.1. Secure annual funding to execute the Statewide Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program by June 30, 2010.
  - 2.1.6.1.1. Identify potential sources of state funding for rail projects.
  - 2.1.6.1.2. Prepare legislation and get legislative approval for funding of the Statewide Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program.
- 2.1.6.2. Develop and obtain legislative approval of administrative procedures and guidelines for the Rail Program by June 30, 2010.
  - 2.1.6.2.1. Develop administrative procedures for the Rail Program based on alternative funding sources.
  - 2.1.6.2.2. Present administrative procedures to the Legislature for approval.
- 2.1.6.3. Present a prioritized list of rail projects to the Legislature for approval by June 30 of each year after the approval and funding of the Statewide Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program.
  - 2.1.6.3.1. Coordinate with railroads, ports, and other stakeholders to identify potential rail projects that will benefit Louisiana.
  - 2.1.6.3.2. Evaluate and prioritize projects identified using the administrative procedures and guidelines.
- 2.1.6.4. Implement rail project approval and funded by the Legislature by June 30 of the year following the project's selection.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 2.1.6: Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	Amount of funds for execution of the State Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program to be secured.	Number of rail projects that are funded.	Ratio of number of rail projects initiated over the number of projects in rail program.		

## 2.2. AVIATION

**Authorized Positions:** (11)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 36:507 (A) and § L.R.S. 2:802

**Program Description:** This program is responsible for airport and aviation safety, regulation, and capital improvement.

**Mission:** The Aviation Program has overall responsibility for management, development, and guidance for Louisiana's aviation system of over 650 public and private airports and heliports. The Program's clients are the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for whom it monitors all publicly owned airports within the state to determine compliance with Federal guidance, oversight, and capital improvement grants; and aviators and the general public for whom it regulates airports and provides airways lighting and electronic navigation aides to enhance both flight and ground safety.

**Goal:** To continue to have a safe, modern, well-managed system of airports that provides convenient and efficient access to the state for tourism, commerce, industrial interest, and recreation. To continually modernize the State's public airports to meet the changing needs of the aviation community and the general public.

2.2.1. Objective: Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

2.2.1.1. Improve the condition of runways, taxiways, and aprons.

2.2.1.1.1. Encourage airports to participate in the Airport Maintenance Program.

2.2.1.1.2. Work to increase state funding for the Aviation Needs and Project Priority Program so that more infrastructure capital improvements projects can be initiated.

2.2.1.2. Improve airport lighting.

2.2.1.2.1. Re-evaluate all airport lighting systems and identify airports with sub-standard systems. Determine priority for upgrading sub-standard lighting systems.

2.2.1.2.2. Work to increase state funding for the Aviation Needs and Project Priority Program so that more lighting projects can be initiated.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 2.2.1: Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Number of airports with the PCI above 70.	Number of airports who's PCI improved to above 70.	Percentage of airports with PCI above 70.		
	Number of airports.				
	Number of airports meeting the state standard for lighting.	Number of airports improved to meet the state standard for lighting.	Percentage of airports that were improved to meet the state standard for lighting.		





### 2.3. PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

**Authorized Positions:** (12)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 36:501(c)

**Program Description:** Manages the State's programs for rural public transportation and metropolitan area transit planning. Most of this budget is financed with Federal funds and passed through to local agencies for capital and operating assistance for public transit systems serving the general public, elderly and disabled persons, and for metropolitan area planning organizations.

**Mission:** To improve public transit in all areas of the state so that Louisiana's citizens may enjoy an adequate level of personal mobility regardless of geographical location, physical limitation or economic status.

**Goal:** To establish a public transportation system in all parishes by 2020.

2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 2.3.1.1. Maximize coordination efforts to minimize trip cost and optimize the use of automation in compiling transit statistics.
- 2.3.1.2. Survey agencies to determine additional needs.
- 2.3.1.3. Update inventory and condition of FTA funded vehicles in the fleet.
- 2.3.1.4. Develop and conduct workshops to train agencies.
- 2.3.1.5. Develop and monitor vehicle use and maintenance reports. Conduct site reviews to determine agency compliance with FTA regulations and provide feedback.
- 2.3.1.6. Develop a funding plan that includes local or state (non-federal) revenues to facilitate expansion of the public transportation program into two (2) additional parishes per year.
- 2.3.1.7. Identify funding sources to provide one-half of the match for available federal dollars to operate a rural transit system.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 2.3.1: To expand the public transportation services that provides low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.	The 64 Louisiana parishes.	Total number of participating parishes.	Number of additional participating parishes.		

### 3. OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS

#### 3.1. OFFICE OF ENGINEERING

**Authorized Positions:** (660)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 36:507 (B) and Title 48

**Program Description:** This program provides planning, design, and construction of highways.

**Mission:** To develop and construct a safe, cost-effective and efficient highway system which will satisfy the needs of the motoring public and serve the economic development of the State in an environmentally compatible manner.

**Goal:**

Continuously improve the performance of the Office of Engineering

Deliver cost effective products, projects and services in a timely manner

Improve customer service and public confidence

Effectively develop and manage our human resources

Efficiently manage the financial resources available to the Office of Engineering

- 3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater  
National Highway System – 95% or greater  
Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater  
Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Strategies:

- 3.1.1.1. Determine the most current “measured” percentage in less than fair condition.
- 3.1.1.2. Present ride-ability data to management in graphic and tabular format.
- 3.1.1.3. In interim years, calculate P.I. by extrapolation of available data.
- 3.1.1.4. Recommend an appropriate budget based upon the latest known percentage so that the objective remains on target.
- 3.1.1.5. Compare needs to current budget partition and recommend budget revisions if necessary.
- 3.1.1.6. Review program pavement rehabilitation projects annually to achieve objective.
- 3.1.1.7. Review Pavement Management System (PMS) recommended projects with Headquarters Pavement Program Manager to obtain initial input.
- 3.1.1.8. Review recommended projects with teams to select projects and develop letting program.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Continuously improve the performance of DOTD.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.1: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.	Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System.	Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System that have been improved.	Percentage of highway miles in Interstate Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.		
	Total number of miles for National Highway System.	Total number of miles for National Highway System that have been improved.	Percentage of highway miles in National Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.		
	Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide Significance.	Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide Significance that have been improved.	Percentage of highway miles in Highways of Statewide Significance in fair or higher (greater) condition.		
	Total number of miles of Regional Highway System.	Total number of miles of Regional Highway System that have been improved.	Percentage of highway miles in Regional Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.		

3.1.2. Objective: Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.1.2.1. Perform program feasibility analyses annually.
- 3.1.2.2. Continue public outreach program.
- 3.1.2.3. Initiate design contracts with consultants and sub-contractors.
- 3.1.2.4. Acquire required right-of-way.
- 3.1.2.5. Obtain utility relocations agreements.
- 3.1.2.6. Obtain required permits from regulatory agencies.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.					
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 3.1.2: Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.	Budget for road projects in TIMED program	Expenditures for road projects in TIMED program	Overall percent program funds expended for TIMED road projects.			
	Budget for bridge projects in TIMED program	Expenditures for bridge projects in TIMED program	Overall percent program funds expended for TIMED bridge projects.			

3.1.3. Objective: Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 3013.

Strategies:

- 3.1.3.1. Complete development of Bridge Management System.
  - 3.1.3.1.1. Generate inventory and condition data for all bridges.
  - 3.1.3.1.2. Develop BMS preservation models.
  - 3.1.3.1.3. Utilize BMS to generate performance indicator data.
  - 3.1.3.1.4. Utilize BMS to establish funding needs.
  - 3.1.3.1.5. Determine needs for improvements (Bridge Replacement).
  - 3.1.3.1.6. Determine needs for repair/rehabilitation.
  - 3.1.3.1.7. Seek additional funding for lower cost preservation projects to slow migration of bridges to deficient classification.
- 3.1.3.2. Maintain Annual Statewide Bridge Preservation Program
  - 3.1.3.2.1. Analyze and quantify statewide bridge preservation needs.
  - 3.1.3.2.2. Annually update and prioritize the bridge program based on funds made available from all sources—maintain a continuous eight-year program with new projects added annually to meet program needs.
- 3.1.3.3. Establish Bridge Preservation Program.
  - 3.1.3.3.1. Analyze the District level preservation needs of the program.
  - 3.1.3.3.2. Develop funding source for the bridge preservation program.
  - 3.1.3.3.3. Implement bridge preservation program in all districts.



GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Improve customer service and public confidence.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.3: Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana’s deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 3013.	Number of bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete on the State system.	Number of bridges that are maintained to meet bridge safety rating requirements.	Percentage of Louisiana bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.		
	Total number of bridges on the State system.				

3.1.4. Objective: Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.1.4.1. Complete two rest areas per calendar year.
- 3.1.4.2. Develop a statewide program for rest area renovations and replacements.
- 3.1.4.3. Develop a prototype for rest areas to be used statewide.
- 3.1.4.4. Continue environmental clearance and design.
- 3.1.4.5. Reconstruct existing rest areas when necessary.
- 3.1.4.6. Construct new rest areas where necessary.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Improve customer service and public confidence.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.4: Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.	Number of rest area locations identified in plan.	Number of rest area locations removed/improved in accordance with plan.	A ratio of the number of rest area locations identified in plan and the number of rest area locations removed/improved in accordance with the plan.		

3.1.5. Objective: Improve the quality of plans and specifications in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.1.5.1. Tracking of addenda/postponements.
- 3.1.5.2. Tracking of change orders.
- 3.1.5.3. Evaluate accuracy of change order coding.
- 3.1.5.4. Conduct regular periodic meetings for plan review.
- 3.1.5.5. Tracking of financial impacts associated with change orders.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.5: Improve the quality of plans and specifications in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Number of addenda, postponements, and change orders recorded quarterly.	Amount of project cost overrun resulting from change orders.	Percentage of addenda, postponements, and change orders recorded quarterly.		

3.1.6. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

3.1.6.1. Maintain Program and Project Management System (PPMS) tracking system.

3.1.6.1.1. Ensure that all projects are entered into PPMS System.

3.1.6.2. Ensure that project managers are Project Management (PM) certified through Project Management Institute (PMI).

3.1.6.3. Require executive level approval for changing or modifying project delivery date (PDD).

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.6: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time) by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Number of projects included in annual program.	Number of projects delivered on time (PDD).	Percentage of projects delivered on time.		

3.1.7. Objective: Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to construction estimate overrun issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

3.1.7.1. Develop and conduct estimating training for project managers.

3.1.7.2. Fully staff Estimates and Valuing Engineering positions.

3.1.7.3. Require timely update of project estimates.

GOAL 2	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.7: Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to construction estimate overrun issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.	Number of projects bid.	Number of projects requiring rebid.	Percent of projects that required rebid.		

3.1.8. Objective: Reduce expropriations for ownership with clear titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

3.1.8.1. Delivery of Right-of-Way maps to Real Estate Section as soon as possible.

3.1.8.2. Provide early notification of project to community or other interested parties.

3.1.8.3. Conduct public awareness campaigns.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Improve customer service and public confidence.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.8: Reduce expropriations for ownership with clean titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Number of ownerships with clear titles to be acquired.	Number of ownerships with clear titles acquired.	Percentage of ownerships with clear titles acquired.		

3.1.9. Objective: Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.1.9.1. Conduct monthly program review with each program manager.
- 3.1.9.2. Interface with DOTD Subcommittee on Finance.
- 3.1.9.3. Adjust projects included in annual budget partition.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Efficiently manage DOTD's financial resources.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.1.9: Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Number of annual engineering programs.	Number of annual engineering programs that are outside 10% of the program budget.	Percentage of annual engineering programs outside the 10% of the program budget.		

3.1.10. Objective: Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

3.1.10.1. Establish and maintain database of final closeout costs on Tracking of Project System (TOPS) or comparable mainframe system.

3.1.10.2. Ensure that Project Engineers maintain scope of project to maintain budget.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Efficiently manage DOTD's financial resources.					
	Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
	Objective 3.1.10 Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013	Project bid costs.	Project construction costs.	Project construction costs as a ratio to project bid costs.		



### 3.2 BRIDGE TRUST

**Authorized Positions:** (149)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 48:1091-48:1106 and § L.R.S. 48:1161-48:1167. Act No. 1 of the 1989 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature renamed the Mississippi River Bridge Authority's bridges to the Crescent City Connection whereupon the former Mississippi River Bridge Authority became the Crescent City Connection Division of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development.

**Program Description:** Responsible for operation and daily maintenance of the Crescent City Connection Division. Bridges include police traffic control activities and toll collections.

**Mission:** The mission of the Bridge Trust Operations Program is to plan, construct, operate, maintain, and police bridges and ferries crossing the Mississippi River as economically, safely, efficiently, and professionally as possible within the Parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard.

**Goal:** Operate and maintain current transportation systems in an efficient manner.

3.2.1. Objective: To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintaining a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

3.2.1.1. Analyze needs and necessary funding for upgrade to working environment, facilities, and equipment.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.2.1: To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintaining a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.	Total operating costs.	Number of vehicles that use the facility.	Total operating cost per vehicle that uses the facility.		

### 3.3. PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

**Authorized Positions:** (62)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 36:507 and Title 48. State Statute § L.R.S. 48:228 through 48:233, both inclusive. Federal Statute: Title 23

**Program Description:** This program is responsible for statewide and metropolitan transportation planning, highway project programming, highway needs assessment, mapping, highway safety policy and program development, bridge and pavement management system development, and highway inventory and traffic monitoring programs.

**Mission:** Provide strategic direction for a seamless, multimodal transportation system.

**Goals:** Continuously improve the performance of the Office of Planning and Programming

Deliver quality products, projects and services in a timely manner and for a reasonable cost

Improve customer service and public confidence

Effectively develop and manage our human resources

Efficiently manage the Office of Planning and Programming's financial resources and assist in managing DOTD's financial resources.

3.3.1. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.3.1.1. Implement the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) through a collaborative partnership with highway safety stakeholders such that the priorities, programs, and projects of each support the emphasis areas identified in the SHSP.
- 3.3.1.2. Improve the system utilized to track roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.
- 3.3.1.3. Identify crash locations and corridors involving roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.
- 3.3.1.4. Develop countermeasures to reduce roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.
- 3.3.1.5. Program a minimum of \$20 million in highway safety construction projects each fiscal year including countermeasures to reduce roadway departures, improve intersections, and improve pedestrian safety.
- 3.3.1.6. Manage the Department's annual Highway Safety Program.
- 3.3.1.7. Program a minimum of \$8 million of highway-rail grade crossing safety improvement projects each fiscal year.
- 3.3.1.8. Manage the Department's annual Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Safety Program.
- 3.3.1.9. Implement the recommendations from the Work Zone Safety Task Force Report.
- 3.3.1.10. Provide Work Zone Training classes to DOTD/Contractor/Consultant personnel.
- 3.3.1.11. Develop a public information program for National Work Zone Awareness Week each fiscal year.
- 3.3.1.12. Work cooperatively and in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Louisiana Highway Safety Commission (LHSC), Louisiana State Police (LSP), National Highway Traffic Safety

Administration (NHTSA), and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to develop and promote traffic safety programs involving engineering, education, and enforcement.

- 3.3.1.13. Develop, implement, and fund statewide traffic safety public information/education/awareness campaigns.
- 3.3.1.14. Improve the quality of traffic crash data.
- 3.3.1.15. Develop and implement the Safe Routes to Schools and Local Road Safety Programs as per SAFETEA-LU.
- 3.3.1.16. Track and report all fatal motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana's public road system to NHTSA by administering the Fatality Analysis and Reporting System (FARS).

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Improve customer service and public confidence.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.3.1: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads for the previous year.	Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads for the current year.	Percent reduction in annual number of traffic crash fatalities compared with the previous year.		

3.3.2. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.3.2.1. Identify abnormal crash locations annually.
- 3.3.2.2. Provide abnormal crash locations to DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers for annual study.
- 3.3.2.3. Review annual recommendations from DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers.
- 3.3.2.4. Prioritize projects based on the greatest safety benefit.
- 3.3.2.5. Recommend highway safety improvement projects to the Headquarters Highway Safety Project Selection Team for inclusion in the Department's Annual Highway Safety Program.
- 3.3.2.6. Conduct evaluation studies to determine program effectiveness.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Improve customer service and public confidence.					
	Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
	Objective 3.3.2: To achieve at least a 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.	Pre-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.	Post-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.	Average percent reduction in crash rates at all safety improvement project locations.		
				Percent reduction in crash rates at individual safety improvement project locations.		

3.3.3. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan\* each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.3.3.1. Establish an internal DOTD Implementation Steering Committee.
- 3.3.3.2. Continue public awareness/education efforts.
- 3.3.3.3. Seek funding from traditional and non-traditional sources.

\*In July 2000, the DOTD initiated an effort to update the state's long-range transportation plan. The planning process has its foundations in public involvement. This was accomplished through an extensive outreach program that included two transportation conferences, consultations with eight advisory councils, a website, several newsletters, nine regional public presentations of the draft plan, and distribution of the draft plan to every public library in the state for review and comment. The planning process was guided by the Louisiana Investment in Infrastructure for Economic Prosperity (LIIEP) Commission created through Act 437 in 2001. The LIIEP Commission adopted the long-range transportation plan in 2003.

The Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan includes the policies, programs, and projects that are needed to strengthen the State's economy and improve the quality of life for Louisiana citizens. It addresses the movement of people and freight across all modes of transportation. The Plan can be accessed through the DOTD website: [www.lastateplan.org](http://www.lastateplan.org).

In June 2007, an effort was initiated to report the status of implementation, update cost estimates, and make minor revisions to the plan.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.3.3: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Total number of elements in the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System	Number of elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current year.	Percent of elements in the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in current year.		



3.3.4. Objective: To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition each fiscal year though June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.3.4.1. Maximize number of miles of congested highways to be improved.
- 3.3.4.2. Submit congestion-relief projects for innovative funding.
- 3.3.4.3. Define minimum state requirements for local growth management policies.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Improve customer service and public confidence.					
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 3.3.4: To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition each year though June 30, 2013.	Total miles of Interstate Highway System classified as urban.	Miles of urban Interstate Highway System that are in an uncongested condition.	Percent of the urban Interstate Highway System in an uncongested condition.			

3.3.5. Objective: To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.3.5.1. Maximize number of miles of congested highways to be improved.
- 3.3.5.2. Submit congestion-relief projects for innovative funding.
- 3.3.5.3. Define minimum State requirements for local growth management policies.
- 3.3.5.4. Develop and maintain a statewide access management policy.
- 3.3.5.5. Maintain the policy on traffic impact analyses for proposed developments.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Improve customer service and public confidence.					
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 3.3.5: To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.	Total miles of National Highway System classified as urban.	Miles of urban National Highway System that are in an uncongested condition.	Percent of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition.			

### 3.4. DISTRICT OPERATIONS

**Authorized Positions:** (3495)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 36:507; 48:259; 48:35

**Program Description:** Field activity of the department including maintenance, field engineering, and field supervision of capital projects; includes materials testing, striping, mowing, contract maintenance, ferry and movable bridge operations, traffic services operations and minor repairs. Engineering work includes traffic, water resources, aviation, design of overlay and interstate rehabilitation projects.

**Mission:** To efficiently plan, design, construct, and maintain a safe transportation network in cooperation with our public and private partners.

**Goals:**

Continuously improve the performance of the districts, division, and sections

Improve customer service and public confidence in the districts, division, and sections

Efficiently manage the financial resources of the districts, division, and sections

Effectively develop and manage the human resources of the districts, division, and sections

Deliver the products, projects, and services of the districts, division, and sections in a cost effective and timely manner

3.4.1. Objective: Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

3.4.1.1. Reduce equipment downtime.

3.4.1.2. Establish and equip one additional crew for signal installation.

3.4.1.3. Expedite the study and design process.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Continuously improve the performance of DOTD.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.4.1: Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Total number of new/modified traffic signal requests during the fiscal year.	Total number of new/modified traffic signal completed and operational in less than six months during the fiscal year.	Percentage of new traffic signal installations/modifications completed and operational during the fiscal year that was done within six months from the date the request was made to the date operational.		

3.4.2. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.4.2.1. Increasing staffing for program management.
- 3.4.2.2. Review and update the DOTD Emergency Operations Plan and Emergency Support Function (ESF) Plans by May 31 each fiscal year through 2013.
- 3.4.2.3. Provide training for all personnel assigned an emergency position (IS-100, IS-700 NIMS, position specific training).
- 3.4.2.4. Participate in local, state, and federal exercises.
- 3.4.2.5. Conduct an after action review following an actual event within two (2) weeks after response ends.
- 3.4.2.6. Conduct an after action review following a scheduled exercise within one (1) week of completion of the exercise.
- 3.4.2.7. Execution of plans for the protection of life and property in response to emergencies/disasters.
- 3.4.2.8. Properly document emergency response, emergency repairs, and permanent work to facilitate reimbursement.
- 3.4.2.9. Protect critical transportation infrastructure against threats.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Continuously improve the performance of DOTD.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.4.2. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.	Total number of projects to be implemented	Number of projects implemented	Percentage of Projects implemented for each fiscal year		

3.4.3. Objective: To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.4.3.1. Develop and implement Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) in metropolitan areas of New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Shreveport/Bossier City, Lafayette, Monroe, Houma, Lake Charles, and Alexandria.
- 3.4.3.2. Establish regional, district, and statewide traffic management centers (TMCs).
- 3.4.3.3. Implement and operate Motorist Assistance Program (MAP) on critical roadways.
- 3.4.3.4. Update statewide Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Traffic Management Center (TMC) Plans.
- 3.4.3.5. Update and enhance the statewide Advanced Traveler Information System (ATIS).
- 3.4.3.6. Update and Enhance the Louisiana Commercial Vehicle Information System and Network (CVISN).

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Improve customer service and public confidence.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.4.3 To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.	Total number of ITS projects / plan	Number of ITS/TMC projects implemented and fully deployed	Percentage of implementation of all projects within the program		

- 3.4.4. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.4.4.1. Identify and establish permanent, recurring funding source maximizing use of federal funds for pavement marking program.
- 3.4.4.2. Develop performance-based specification for pavement markings.
- 3.4.4.3. Create pavement marking database to track material readings.
- 3.4.4.4. Develop plans for Interstate maintenance jobs.
- 3.4.4.5. Monitor segments which fail to meet minimum requirements and warranties.
- 3.4.4.6. Re-evaluate and refine pavement marking replacement program.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.					
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 3.4.4: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.	Total miles of interstate roadways.	Total miles of interstate roadways that pavement markings meet or exceed performance requirements.	Percentage of interstates that meet or exceed performance specifications.			



3.4.5. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

3.4.5.1. Reduce equipment downtime.

3.4.5.2. Develop and implement a district-wide plan.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Deliver cost-effective products, projects, and services in a timely manner.					
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 3.4.5 To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Total non-interstate line miles that are deficient.	Total non-interstate line miles that are re-striped.	Percentage of deficient non-interstate line miles re-striped.			

### 3.5. MARINE OPERATIONS

**Authorized Positions** (87)

**Program Authorization:** § L.R.S. 48:1091-48:1106; § L.R.S. 48:1161-48:1167

**Program Description:** Responsible for operation and daily maintenance of the Crescent City Connection Division ferries, including police traffic control activities and toll collections.

**Mission:** To operate, maintain, and police the ferries crossing the Mississippi River within the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard.

**Goal:** To provide safe and reliable transportation on these ferries as efficiently as possible and in as pleasant an environment as possible.

3.5.1. Objective: To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.

Strategies:

- 3.5.1.1. Conduct a more effective maintenance program.
- 3.5.1.2. Maintain and recondition ferry equipment to extend life.
- 3.5.1.3. Determine whether new or different types of equipment would improve operations.
- 3.5.1.4. Prepare a list of equipment needs.
- 3.5.1.5. Request funding for equipment needs.
- 3.5.1.6. Train personnel in the use and care of all equipment.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix				
	Improve customer service and public confidence.				
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality
Objective 3.5.1: To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.	Total number of scheduled crossings during a period.	Total number of actual crossings during a period.	Percentage of actual crossings during a given period.		

3.5.2. Objective: To maintain ferry-related operations at a passenger cost of not more than \$3.50 per passenger

Strategies:

- 3.5.2.1. Analyze needs and necessary funding for upgrade to working environment, facilities, and equipment.
- 3.5.2.2. Maintain and recondition equipment to extend equipment life.
- 3.5.2.3. Determine whether new or different types of equipment would improve operations.
- 3.5.2.4. Prepare list of equipment and facility needs.
- 3.5.2.5. Seek required funding.
- 3.5.2.6. Purchase/construct/renovate equipment and facilities.

GOAL	Performance Indicator Matrix Efficiently manage DOTD’s financial resources.					
Objective	Input	Output	Outcome	Efficiency	Quality	
Objective 3.5.2: To maintain ferry-related operations at a passenger cost of not more than \$3.50 per passenger	Total ferry operating costs for a previous period.	Total number of passengers for a period.	Total operating cost per passenger.			

**Department of Transportation and Development**

**APPENDIX A**

**Vision 2020 Link**

## Department of Transportation and Development Strategic Plan Integrated Components of Vision 2020

Objective	Vision 2020 Link
1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s Transportation Infrastructure.
1.2.1. Objective: Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
1.2.2. Objective: To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and preventative maintenance programs.	Objective 2.6. – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State’s maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state’s investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
2.1.2. Objective: Optimize the State’s flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state’s investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.	Objective 3.8 – To protect Louisiana’s environment and support sustainable development.
2.1.3. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.	Objective 3.7 – To preserve and develop Louisiana’s natural and cultural assets.  Objective 3.8 – To protect Louisiana’s environment and support sustainable development.
2.1.4. Objective: Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 3.6 – To protect, rehabilitate, and conserve our coastal ecosystems.  Objective 3.7 – To preserve and develop Louisiana’s natural and cultural assets.  Objective 3.8 – To protect Louisiana’s environment and support sustainable development.

2.1.5. Objective: Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
2.1.6. Objective: Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
2.2.1. Objective: Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.	<p>Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective 1.9 – To make workforce education and technical training programs widely available at the secondary and post secondary levels</p> <p>Objective 1.10 – To build a workforce with the education and skills necessary to meet the needs of business in a knowledge-based economy through flexible systems and responsive programs</p> <p>Objective 1.11 – To increase workforce participation rates among traditionally underutilized sources of workers (women, minorities, disabled, ex-offenders, immigrants, elderly, etc)</p> <p>Objective 3.1 – <b>To increase personal income and assets of all citizens</b></p> <p>Objective 3.2 - <b>To provide opportunities and support to overcome Louisiana's poverty crisis</b></p>
3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
3.1.2. Objective: Implement accelerated TIMED program so that	

all bridge projects are completed by the end of December 2010; road projects by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.1.3. Objective: Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana’s deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure. Objective 2.1 - To retain, modernize, and grow Louisiana’s existing industries and grow emerging technology-based businesses through cluster-based development practices
3.1.4. Objective: Improve Louisiana’s public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.1.5. Objective: Improve the quality of plans and specifications in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.1.6. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.1.7. Objective: Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to construction estimate overrun issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.1.8. Objective: Reduce expropriations for ownership with clear titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.1.9. Objective: Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.1.10. Objective: Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.2.1. Objective: To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintain a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.
3.3.1. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure. Objective 3.5 – To ensure safe, vibrant, and supportive communities for all citizens.
3.3.2. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation



non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.	infrastructure. Objective 3.5 – To ensure safe, vibrant, and supportive communities for all citizens.
3.3.3. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan* each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<p>Objective 1.9 - To make workforce education and technical training programs widely available at the secondary and post secondary levels</p> <p>Objective 1.10 – To build a workforce with the education and skills necessary to meet the needs of business in a knowledge-based economy through flexible systems and responsive programs.</p> <p>Objective 1.11 – To increase workforce participation rates among traditionally underutilized sources of workers (women, minorities, disabled, ex-offenders, immigrants, elderly, etc.).</p> <p>Objective 2.1 – To retain, modernize, and grow Louisiana’s existing industries and grow emerging technology-based businesses through cluster-based development practices.</p> <p>Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective 3.1 – To increase personal income and assets of all citizens.</p> <p>Objective 3.2 – To provide opportunities and support to overcome Louisiana’s poverty crisis.</p> <p>Objective 3. 5 – To ensure safe, vibrant, and supportive communities for all citizens</p> <p>Objective 3.8 – To protect Louisiana’s environment and support sustainable development</p>

<p>3.3.4. Objective: To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.</p>	<p>Objective 2.1 – To retain, modernize, and grow Louisiana’s existing industries and grow emerging technology-based businesses through cluster-based development practices.</p> <p>Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective 3.1 – To increase personal income and assets of all citizens.</p> <p>Objective 3.2 – To provide opportunities and support to overcome Louisiana’s poverty crisis.</p> <p>Objective 3.8 – To protect Louisiana’s environment and support sustainable development.</p>
<p>3.3.5. Objective: To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.</p>	<p>Objective 2.1 – To retain, modernize, and grow Louisiana’s existing industries and grow emerging technology-based businesses through cluster-based development practices.</p> <p>Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective 3.1 – To increase personal income and assets of all citizens.</p> <p>Objective 3.2 – To provide opportunities and support to overcome Louisiana’s poverty crisis.</p> <p>Objective 3.8 – To protect Louisiana’s environment and support sustainable development.</p>
<p>3.4.1. Objective: Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.</p>	<p>Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana’s transportation infrastructure.</p>

3.4.2. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
3.4.3. Objective: To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
3.4.4. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
3.4.5. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
3.5.1. Objective: maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.
3.5.2. Objective: To maintain ferry-related operations at a passenger cost of not more than \$3.50 per passenger	Objective 2.6 – To develop and promote Louisiana's transportation infrastructure.

**Department of Transportation and Development**

**APPENDIX B**

**Principal Clients**

## Department of Transportation and Development Strategic Plan Principal Clients

Objective	Principal Clients
1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, Districts, Public Relations Department</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Public Officials, MPOs, Federal Highway Administration, Federal and State Resource and Regulatory Agencies, the motoring public</p>
1.2.1. Objective: Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Workforce, Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, MPOs, and the motoring public.</p>
1.2.2. Objective: To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, Department Heads</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – DOA, the Legislature, and the general public</p>
2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State’s maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state’s investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Citizens who will benefit from jobs created/retained, Louisiana industries, community/governing bodies responsible for adopting programs, the Port Authority, the Port Association of Louisiana (PAL), the Governor, the Legislature, and federal and state regulatory agencies.</p>
2.1.2. Objective: Optimize the State’s flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state’s investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Community/governing bodies responsible for adopting programs, flood insurance policyholders, FEMA, Corps of Engineers, levee boards, Congress, the Legislature, and the Governor.</p>
2.1.3. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Flood insurance policyholders, FEMA, Corps of Engineers, levee boards, Congress, the Legislature, and the Governor.</p>

<p>2.1.4. Objective: Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.</p>	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, Environmental and Real Estate Sections</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Louisiana industries, FEMA, community/governing bodies responsible for adopting programs, Corps of Engineers, Municipal Water Systems, the Governor, the Congress, the Legislature, federal and state regulatory agencies, federal/state/local agencies, municipal suppliers, rural residents with individual sources of drinking water, and dam owners.</p>
<p>2.1.5. Objective: Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana’s navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.</p>	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration and the Office of Planning and Programming</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Marine industry, shippers, ports, Corps, waterway organizations, the Coast Guard, MARAD, and the public</p>
<p>2.1.6. Objective: Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.</p>	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration and the Office of Planning and Programming</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Marine industry, shippers, ports, Corps, waterway organizations, the Coast Guard, MARAD, and the public</p>
<p>2.2.1. Objective: Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.</p>	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Workforce, Office of Planning and Programming</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Citizens who will benefit from jobs created/retained, Louisiana industries, external clients, MPOs, community/governing bodies responsible for adopting programs, Port Authority, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Governor, the Congress, the Legislature, the Federal Transit Authority (FTA), federal and state regulatory agencies, and federal and state Offices of Economic Development.</p>
<p>2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.</p>	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, Office of Planning and Programming</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Federal Transit Authority (FTA), the Governor, Congress, the Legislature local governments, and transit agencies.</p>

3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Workforce, Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Louisiana industries, external clients, the motoring public, MPOs, LTA, FWHA, American Trucking Association, Community Rating System, the Governor, the Congress, the Legislature, and federal and regulatory agencies.</p>
3.1.2. Objective: Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, MPOs, the motoring public, the general public, and Louisiana businesses.</p>
3.1.3. Objective: Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public</p>
3.1.4. Objective: Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the motoring public, and the tourism industry.</p>
3.1.5. Objective: Improve the quality of plans and specifications in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public</p>
3.1.6. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time (PPD) by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public</p>
3.1.7. Objective: Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to estimate issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public</p>
3.1.8. Objective: Reduce expropriations for ownership with clear titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<p><u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee</p> <p><u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public</p>

3.1.9. Objective: Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee  <u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public
3.1.10. Objective: Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee  <u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, the motoring public
3.2.1. Objective: To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintain a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Crescent City Connection District, DOTD Administration  <u>External Clients</u> – Internal Auditors, the motoring public
3.3.1. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, District Traffic Engineers, Traffic Safety Project Selection Team  <u>External Clients</u> – Motoring public, Federal Highway Administration, Louisiana Highway Safety Commission, Operation Lifesaver, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD), the insurance industry, etc
3.3.2. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, District Traffic Engineers, Traffic Safety Project Selection Team  <u>External Clients</u> – Motoring public, the Federal Highway Administration
3.3.3. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan* each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, Program Managers  <u>External Clients</u> – The public, elected officials, MPOs, business and industry, LIIEP Commission, Transportation Advisory Councils, and the Federal Highway Administration
3.3.4. Objective: To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, District Administrators, Capacity Project Selection Team  <u>External Clients</u> – The public, elected officials, MPOs, business and industry, and the Federal Highway Administration
3.3.5. Objective: To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through	<u>Internal Clients</u> – Executive Committee, District Administrators,



June 30, 2013.	Capacity Project Selection Team  <u>External Clients</u> – The public, elected officials, MPOs, business and industry, and the Federal Highway Administration
3.4.1. Objective: Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts  <u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, tourism industry, and the motoring public.
3.4.2. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts  <u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the general public, MPOs, business and industry
3.4.3. Objective: To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts  <u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the tourism industry, and the motoring public.
3.4.4. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts  <u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the motoring public, and the tourism industry.
3.4.5. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, DOTD Districts  <u>External Clients</u> – Elected officials, the motoring public
3.5.1. Objective: To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.	<u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, Internal Auditors  <u>External Clients</u> – Legislative Auditors and the motoring public
3.5.2. Objective: To maintain ferry-related operations at a passenger cost of not more than \$3.50 per passenger	<u>Internal Clients</u> – DOTD Administration, Internal Auditors  <u>External Clients</u> – Legislative Auditors and the motoring public



**Department of Transportation and Development**

**APPENDIX C**

**External Factors**

## Department of Transportation and Development Strategic Plan External Factors

Objective	External Factors
1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of ten initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Number of customer survey respondents</li> <li>-Responses to customer surveys</li> </ul>
1.2.1. Objective: Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Available workforce</li> <li>-Salary levels</li> <li>-Competition from consultants</li> <li>-Workforce job satisfaction</li> </ul>
1.2.2. Objective: To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Available budget</li> <li>-Personnel costs</li> <li>-Benefit costs</li> </ul>
2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Program authorization</li> <li>-Global market</li> </ul>
2.1.2. Objective: Optimize the State's flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Program authorization</li> <li>-Weather</li> </ul>
2.1.3. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Community governing bodies that are responsible for adopting their CRS</li> </ul>
2.1.4. Objective: Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-State budget</li> <li>-State and local economy</li> <li>-Number of replacement wells</li> <li>-Mobility of population/influx of new residents</li> <li>-Number of dams/impoundments under construction</li> <li>-FEMA grants</li> </ul>

2.1.5. Objective: Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	-Without adequate resources being provided, navigation projects cannot be undertaken.
2.1.6. Objective: Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	-Without adequate resources being provided, navigation projects cannot be undertaken
2.2.1. Objective: Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	-Lack of state or local resources to match federal funds for capital improvement -Inadequate federal funds to meet the demands of proposed airport projects
2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.	-Lack of state and/or local resources to match federal funds to operate a system. -Inadequate federal funds to expand into additional parishes.
3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.	-Insufficient funds to meet goals -Catastrophic weather/environmental conditions
3.1.2. Objective: Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.	-Weather -Inflation -Construction materials escalation -Bond market -Interest rates -Resource Agencies

3.1.3. Objective: Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Availability of funding sources</li> <li>-Unforeseen additional demands on programmed funding</li> <li>-Inflationary effects or "buying power" of funds</li> <li>-Rate of deterioration of existing bridge inventory</li> <li>-Project chargeable costs associated with Environmental Documentation and Mitigation</li> <li>-Project chargeable costs associated with Right-of-Way and utility locations</li> <li>-Cost increases associated with world-wide material supplies/demands</li> <li>-Cost increases associated with more stringent design specification requirements</li> </ul>
3.1.4. Objective: Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Budget</li> <li>-Bond interest rates</li> <li>-Construction costs</li> <li>-Unforeseen additional demands on programmed funding</li> <li>-Inflationary effects or "buying power" of funds</li> </ul>
3.1.5. Objective: Improve the quality of plans and specifications in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<b>-Timely review of plans and specifications</b>
3.1.6. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Budget</li> <li>-Projects chargeable costs associated with Right-of-way and utility locations</li> <li>-R/R agreement</li> <li>-Corp of Engineer (COE) permits</li> </ul>
3.1.7. Objective: Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to construction estimate overrun issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Budget</li> <li>-Construction costs</li> <li>- Inflationary effects or "buying power" of funds</li> </ul>
3.1.8. Objective: Reduce expropriations for ownership with clean titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Budget</li> <li>-Construction costs</li> <li>-Timely review of plans and surveys</li> </ul>
3.1.9. Objective: Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Inflationary effects or "buying power" of funds</li> <li>-Construction costs</li> </ul>
3.1.10. Objective: Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Budget</li> <li>-Construction costs</li> <li>-Unforeseen conditions at project site</li> </ul>

3.2.1. Objective: To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintain a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.	-Inflation -Workforce availability
3.3.1. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	-Funding for safety campaigns and improvement projects, law enforcement, and driver education
3.3.2. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.	-Funding for safety improvement projects
3.3.3. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan* each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	-Funding for Plan implementation -Legislation to enact policy elements
3.3.4. Objective: To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	-Funding for congestion relief projects -Political support for growth management policies such as traffic impact mitigation fees, land use controls, etc.
3.3.5. Objective: To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.	-Funding for congestion relief projects -Political support for growth management policies such as traffic impact mitigation fees, land use controls, etc.
3.4.1. Objective: Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	-Available workforce -Budget -Material costs
3.4.2. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.	-Available workforce -Budget
3.4.3. Objective: To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.	-Available workforce -Available federal and state funds -Materials and subcontractor costs
3.4.4. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.	-Workforce availability -Available federal and state funds -Material costs
3.4.5. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	-Workforce availability -Weather -Material costs -Properly working equipment

3.5.1. Objective: To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Availability of funding sources</li> <li>-Projected maintenance costs of ferry equipment (labor and parts)</li> <li>-Projected staffing level need to achieve goals</li> </ul>
3.5.2. Objective: To maintain ferry-related operations at a passenger cost of not more than \$3.50 per passenger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Increase cost of supplies (such as fuel)</li> <li>-Additional payroll costs</li> <li>-Decreased rider ship</li> </ul>



**Department of Transportation and Development**

**APPENDIX D**

**Duplication of Efforts**

## Department of Transportation and Development Strategic Plan Duplication of Efforts

Objective	Duplication of Efforts
1.1.1. Objective: Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	None
1.2.1. Objective: Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency has the responsibility for recruiting and training the DOTD workforce.
1.2.2. Objective: To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.	None
2.1.1. Objective: To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency has a competitive and statewide program to partner with public port authorities to provide port infrastructure.
2.1.2. Objective: Optimize the State's flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency has a competitive and statewide program to partner with the Corps of Engineers to provide flood control infrastructure.
2.1.3. Objective: Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.	There is no duplication of efforts by other governing bodies.
2.1.4. Objective: Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency has a statewide program to perform water resources infrastructure assessments.
2.1.5. Objective: Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	No other state agency has the responsibility for Louisiana's water transportation system; therefore, there is no duplication of effort.
2.1.6. Objective: Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development	No other state agency has the responsibility for Louisiana's water transportation system; therefore, there is no duplication of effort.

and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.	
2.2.1. Objective: Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs these tasks or exercises control over public aviation statewide.
2.3.1. Objective: To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercises control over public transit systems statewide.
3.1.1. Objective: Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.	No other agencies maintain state roads; several parishes have minimal impact on ride-ability quality maintenance work.
3.1.2. Objective: Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.1.3. Objective: Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.	No other agencies currently provide bridge repair or maintenance work on state bridges.
3.1.4. Objective: Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.1.5. Objective: Improve the quality of plans and specifications in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.1.6. Objective: Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time (by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.1.7. Objective: Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to construction estimate overrun issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.1.8. Objective: Reduce expropriations for ownership with clean titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.1.9. Objective: Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget patricians each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.
3.1.10. Objective: Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercise the control on a statewide basis.

3.2.1. Objective: To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintain a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercises the control on a statewide basis for the Bridge Trust.
3.3.1. Objective: To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	Overall highway safety is a joint responsibility among any Federal, State, local government agencies, and civic and industry organizations. The DOTD works with our partners to ensure coordination and avoid duplication.
3.3.2. Objective: To achieve at least 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.	No other agency or department conducts site-specific crash rate evaluations of safety improvements.
3.3.3. Objective: Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan* each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other State agency or department is responsible for monitoring the progress on the overall plan implementation.
3.3.4. Objective: To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition each fiscal year though June 30, 2013.	No other State agency or department is responsible for implementing congestion relief improvements on the urban Interstate Highway System.
3.3.5. Objective: To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.	No other State agency or department is responsible for implementing congestion relief on the urban National Highway System.
3.4.1. Objective: Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	DOTD has the responsibility for installing traffic signals on the state highway system, whereas off system roadways are the responsibility of the local governing body.
3.4.2. Objective: Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.	DOTD's Emergency Management Plan is done in conjunction with the State's Emergency Operations Plan and the Governor's Office of Homeland Security Emergency Preparedness (GOHSEP).
3.4.3. Objective: To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the task or exercises the control on statewide basis.
3.4.4. Objective: To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the task or exercises the control on statewide basis.
3.4.5. Objective: To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-stripped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the task or exercises the control on statewide basis.

3.5.1. Objective: To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercises control of this Marine Trust.
3.5.2. Objective: To maintain ferry-related operations at a passenger cost of not more than \$3.50 per passenger	No other state agency or department performs the tasks or exercises the control on a statewide basis.

**Department of Transportation and Development**

**APPENDIX E**

**Performance Indicator Documentation**

### **Performance Indicator Documentation**

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.1. Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Target of 5 formal communication programs.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Agency should have the capacity to initiate and institute public information campaigns for notification of pending projects, project status, programs, agency success stories, and other information of interest to the public and other constituents.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is maintained by Public Affairs and Customer Service. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The target figure is 5 initiatives with participation tracked on a monthly basis.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Simple tracking system of the number of opportunities for public contact of vital agency related information.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The manager of the Customer Service Program and the Public Relations Director
9. Indicator Limitations:	Yes, to the extent of the data reliability capturing mechanisms.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Executive management will consider this information in developing corrective action plans to improve customer service and public confidence.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.1. Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of formal communication programs initiated.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The agency should have the capacity to initiate the public information campaigns for notification of pending projects, project status, programs, agency success stories, and other information of interest to the public and other constituents.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is maintained by Public Affairs and Customer Service. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The target figure is ten initiatives with participation tracked on a monthly basis.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Simple tracking system of the number of opportunities for public contact of vital agency related information.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Public Relations Director and Customer Service Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Executive management will consider this information in developing corrective action plans to improve customer service and public confidence.



Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.1. Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of 5 initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of formal communication programs initiated divided by 5.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a percentage that indicates the number of formal communication programs that have been initiated.
3. Indicator Source:	It is a tracking system of public service initiatives.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Monthly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally. The calculation is standard.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Public Affairs Director and the Customer Service Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	It is dependent upon the completeness and accuracy of information provided to Public Affairs and Customer Service by other DOTD programs/sections.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Executive management will consider this information in developing corrective action plans to improve customer service and public confidence.

Program: Office of the Secretary

Objective: 1.1.1. Improve customer service and public confidence through a minimum of ten initiatives/programs each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Customer service satisfaction score.

1. Indicator Type:	Quality
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator provides customer service satisfaction that can be generalized to a larger population to the extent that a representative sample is polled in surveys.
3. Indicator Source:	It is a numeric tally of customer service survey questions and statistical analyses of the data gathered in the surveys. It is very reliable if representative samples are used.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Mean, median, mode, regression, correlation, and/or hierarchical regression, and factor analyses. Qualitative analysis techniques will also be used when applicable. These are standard calculations.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Public Affairs Director and Customer Service Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is limited only to the extent that a representative sample is included in the study for the statistical significance.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Executive management will consider this information in developing corrective action plans to improve customer service and public confidence.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Average number of vacant positions.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure the overall vacancy rate.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the Human Resources Department. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The data is collected on an ongoing basis and is reported on a quarterly basis.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the average number of vacancies during the period. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The data will be used by management to formulate initiatives to attract and retain employees.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of approved positions.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To use as an overall target for staffing levels.
3. Indicator Source:	The Legislature approves the approved number of positions for the department as indicated in the DOTD budget. It is a very reliable indicator.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The total is set at the beginning of the fiscal year and does not change.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The number of positions is a simple count.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Approved positions refer to the number of positions within each budget unit that have been approved by the Legislature.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used by management to determine the number of approved positions.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of positions filled.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Measures TO
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator is maintained by the Human Resources Department. It is a very reliable indicator.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The data is collected continuously and is reported on a quarterly basis.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	Management at all levels will use this figure to gauge the effectiveness of recruiting and retention efforts.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Vacancy Rate

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It will show a comparison of actual to approved staffing levels.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the Human Resources Department. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The data is collected continuously and is reported on a quarterly basis.
5. Calculation Methodology:	This is a standard calculation of the average number of vacant positions divided by the total number of approved positions. This result is then converted into a percentage figure.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management at all levels will use this figure to gauge the effectiveness of recruiting and retention efforts.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.1. Maintain overall department-wide vacancy rate at 2% or less each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of positions filled over number of vacant positions.

1. Indicator Type:	Efficiency
2. Indicator Rationale:	This indicator enables the organization to gauge its efforts to adequately staff the agency.
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator source is the Human Resources Director. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Data is continuously collected and reported quarterly.
5. Calculation Methodology:	This is going to be a standard calculation of the average number of vacant positions divided by the total number of approved positions. This result is then converted into a percentage figure.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Human Resources
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management at all levels will use this figure to gauge the effectiveness of recruiting and retention efforts.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.2. To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.

Indicator: Budgeted construction funds.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total operating budget.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD financial systems.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	Ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.



Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.2. To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.

Indicator: Budgeted maintenance funds.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total operating budget.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD financial systems.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.2. To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.

Indicator: Actual administrative expenditures.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total construction and maintenance program.
3. Indicator Source:	The DOTD financial system. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.2. To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.

Indicator: Actual construction expenditures.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total construction and maintenance program.
3. Indicator Source:	The DOTD financial system. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.2. To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.

Indicator: Actual maintenance expenditures.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total construction and maintenance program.
3. Indicator Source:	The DOTD financial system. The data is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To ensure that possible funds are utilized to support construction and maintenance programs.

Program: Office of Management and Finance

Objective: 1.2.2. To limit administrative costs to no more than 5% of the total construction and maintenance expenditures so that all possible funds can be utilized for the DOTD construction and maintenance programs.

Indicator: Actual construction and maintenance expenditures divided by the actual administrative expenditures equal to the percent of construction and maintenance programs.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is a measured ratio.
3. Indicator Source:	The DOTD financial system. It is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Undersecretary of Management and Finance
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Indicator allows management to gauge how Louisiana compares to other states. A report is published on an annual basis by the Federal Highway Administration.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.1. To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to Ensure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: State's share of construction expenditures.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The number of program benefits is an indicator of the progress towards accomplishing our goal.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's accounting Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	A quarterly report is produced which shows the expenditures to date for the program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Port Priority Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.1. To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total benefits.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The amount of funds expended is an indicator of the progress towards accomplishing our goal.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's accounting Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	A quarterly report is produced which shows the expenditures to date for all the programs.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Port Priority Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.1. To conduct the State's maritime infrastructure development activities to insure that Louisiana maintains its top position in maritime commerce as measured by the total foreign and domestic cargo tonnage, by investing in port and harbor infrastructure that will return to the state at least five times the state's investment in benefits through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: State's return on investment (ROI)

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	The ROI is a measure of the outcome of the state's investment.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's accounting Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The state's share of construction expenditures for each project for the period is multiplied by the benefit-cost ration of each project and totaled. This total is then divided by the total state expenditures for the period. The ROI will be reported as an average return on investment of state dollars for all projects during the period. For example, five dollars return for one dollar invested.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Port Priority Program Manager
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.



Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.2. Optimize the State's flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: All flood control program expenditures.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The amount of state funds expended (combined SWF and HPP) is an indicator of the progress towards accomplishing our goal.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's accounting database.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	A quarterly report is produced which shows the expenditures to date for the program. It is the total construction expenditures for the period for both federal and state.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Flood Protection Programs Director
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.2. Optimize the State's flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total benefits.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The amount of program funds expended (combined SWF and HPP) is an indicator of the progress towards accomplishing our goal.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Daily
5. Calculation Methodology:	A monthly report is produced which shows total benefits for all programs.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Flood Protection Programs Director
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to measure progress.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.2. Optimize the State's flood control activities, both structural and non-structural, by investing in flood control projects that will return at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: State's return on investment (ROI).

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a measure of the outcome of the state's investment.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD's database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Monthly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The total construction expenditures (Federal and State) for each project for the quarter are multiplied by the benefit-cost ratio of each project and totaled. This total is then divided by the total state expenditures for the period. The ROI will be reported as an average return on investment of state dollars for all projects during the period.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Flood Protection Programs Director
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to determine the effectiveness of the program.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.3. Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of flood insurance policyholders.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a measurement of participation in the NFIP Program.
3. Indicator Source:	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually, using Federal fiscal year dates.
5. Calculation Methodology:	FEMA contracts with an independent firm specializing in survey administration to compile the data. A standard calculation is used.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Community Rating System (CRS)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	FEMA
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to establish the baseline number of insurance policyholders.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.3. Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System (CRS) so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Flood insurance policyholders receiving rate reductions

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a measurement of participation in the NFIP-CRS Program. It is the number of flood insurance policy holders in a community that are participating in the NFIP-CRS program who receive rate reductions.
3. Indicator Source:	FEMA
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually, using Federal fiscal year dates
5. Calculation Methodology:	FEMA contracts with an independent firm specializing in survey administration to compile the data. A standard calculation is used.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Community Rating System (CRS)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	FEMA
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to determine the effectiveness of the Louisiana Floodplain Management Program, to manage the program's resources, and in scheduling community visits and community contact frequency.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.3. Increase participation in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Rating System so that 82% of flood insurance policyholders receive insurance rate reductions annually by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of policyholders receiving insurance rate reductions.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Percentage of participation in the NFIP-CRS program; all flood insurance policyholders in a community participating in the NFIP-CRS program who receive rate reductions.
3. Indicator Source:	FEMA
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually, based on the Federal fiscal year
5. Calculation Methodology:	FEMA contracts with an independent firm specializing in survey administration to compile the data. A standard calculation is used.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Community Rating System (CRS)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	FEMA
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to determine the effectiveness of the Louisiana Floodplain Management Program, to manage the program's resources, and in scheduling community visits and community contact frequency.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of levee districts having hurricane protection systems that require assessments.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	§ L.R.S. 38:247 and § L.R.S. 38:301.1 mandate that DOTD cause flood protection levees and structures within the Louisiana Coastal Zone to be inspected and to maintain a report on such inspections. Every levee district located wholly or partially within the coastal zone and every parish governing authority for parishes located wholly or partially within the coastal zone must inspect their flood protection system and submit a levee evaluation report to DOTD Office of Public Works, Hurricane Flood Protection, and Intermodal Transportation.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Hurricane Flood Protection Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly levee district inspection reports submitted to DOTD.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is a count of the number of levees districts with hurricane protection systems.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Hurricane Flood Protection staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used to determine the resources required to ensure compliance with the levee inspection program.





Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of new registered water wells in the state.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	§ L.R.S. 38:3091 through § L.R.S. 38:3098.8 mandates that water wells are to be properly registered.
3. Indicator Source:	Water well information comes to this office directly from the water well driller/contractor. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Receive water well registration forms daily.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is a count of the total number of new registered wells.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Water Resources staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation lies in the total number of new wells drilled which controls the number of wells that are registered per month which varies due to public needs, economic constraints of the public, and the general economic well being of the local economy.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used to determine the scope of the program and resources required.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Actual number of dams scheduled for inspection per year.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Act No. 733 of the 1981 Regular Session (§ L.R.S. 38:21-28), which provides for a Dam Safety and Regulatory Program requiring periodic inspections.
3. Indicator Source:	The number of dams inspected.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	An electronic calendar is utilized to set the dam inspection schedule. Dam Safety staff notify dam owners, in writing, 30 days prior to the scheduled dam inspection with a follow up notification sent one (1) week prior to arriving at the dam site. Dam inspection reports are received daily.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by the number of dams scheduled for inspection per year.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Dam Safety staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	It is used as a part of the efficiency formula with respect to meeting the goals of the Department and improves the Dam Safety Program. It also determines the scope of the effort.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Actual number of completed assessments for levee districts having hurricane protection systems.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	§ L.R.S. 38:247 and § L.R.S. 38:301.1 mandate that DOTD cause flood protection levees and structures within the Louisiana Coastal Zone to be inspected and to maintain a report on such inspections. Every levee district located wholly or partially within the coastal zone and every parish governing authority for parishes located wholly or partially within the coastal zone must inspect their flood protection system and submit a levee evaluation report to DOTD Office of Public Works, Hurricane Flood Protection, and Intermodal Transportation.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Hurricane Flood Protection Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly levee district inspection reports submitted to DOTD.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is a count of the number of levee district assessments completed with reports submitted to DOTD.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Hurricane Flood Protection staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation to this indicator is it is dependent on the levee districts completing and submitting their required reports to DOTD.
10. Indicator use in Management decision:	It is used to determine the resources required to ensure compliance with the levee

making and Agency processes:	inspection program.
------------------------------	---------------------

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Number of new registered water wells that meet construction standards.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	§ L.R.S. 38:3091 through § L.R.S. 38:3098.8 mandates that water wells are to be properly registered.
3. Indicator Source:	Well inspection reports are the source.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Monthly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The number of new registered wells that are inspected.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Water Resources staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation lies in the total number of wells registered.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used in conjunction with the input to indicate the efficiency of the program.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Actual number of dams inspected per year

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Act No. 733 of the 1981 Regular Session (§ L.R.S. 38:21-28), which provides for a Dam Safety and Regulatory Program requiring periodic inspections.
3. Indicator Source:	Dam inspection
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Dam inspection reports are received daily.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The actual number of dams inspected per year.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Dam Safety staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	The weather
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used as part of the efficiency formula with respect to meeting the goals of the Department and improves the Dam Safety Program.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Percentage of required levee district assessments completed.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	§ L.R.S. 38:247 and § L.R.S. 38:301.1 mandate that DOTD cause flood protection levees and structures within the Louisiana Coastal Zone to be inspected and to maintain a report on such inspections. Every levee district located wholly or partially within the coastal zone and every parish governing authority for parishes located wholly or partially within the coastal zone must inspect their flood protection system and submit a levee evaluation report to DOTD Office of Public Works, Hurricane Flood Protection, and Intermodal Transportation.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Hurricane Flood Protection Database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly levee district inspection reports submitted to DOTD.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The number of required completed assessments, divided by the total number of levee districts with hurricane protection systems, multiplied by 100.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Hurricane Flood Protection staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	It is dependent upon the levee districts completing and submitting their required reports to DOTD.
10. Indicator use in Management decision:	It is used to determine the resources required to ensure compliance with the levee

making and Agency processes:	inspection program.
------------------------------	---------------------

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Percentage of new registered water wells that meet construction standards.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	§ L.R.S. 38:3091 through § L.R.S. 38:3098.8 mandates that water wells are to be properly registered.
3. Indicator Source:	The number of registered wells in compliance.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Monthly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The ratio of the total number of wells in compliance divided by the total number of wells inspected multiplied by 100.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Water Resources staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation lies in the total number of registered wells inspected per month versus the number of wells out of compliance.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used to determine the effectiveness of the Water Resources program with respect to striving to achieve 100% compliance with the state's water well construction standards for all new registered water wells drilled in Louisiana.





Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Percentage of dam safety inspections completed on schedule.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Act No. 733 of the 1981 Regular Session (§ L.R.S. 38:21-28), which provides for a Dam Safety and Regulatory Program requiring periodic inspections.
3. Indicator Source:	The actual number of dams inspected per year.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard percentage which is taken from the actual number of dams inspected per year that is divided by the total number of dams scheduled for inspection per year times 100.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Dam Safety staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	The weather
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used to determine the effectiveness of the program.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.4. Complete 100% of the required water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments (flood protection systems, dam safety, and water wells) each fiscal year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Percentage of all water resources infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments completed.

1. Indicator Type:	Efficiency
2. Indicator Rationale:	§ L.R.S. 38:247 and § L.R.S. 38:301.1 for hurricane system assessment; § L.R.S. 38:3091 through § L.R.S. 39:3090.8 mandates that water wells are to be properly registered; § L.R.S. 38:21-28 provides for a Dam Safety and Regulatory Program.
3. Indicator Source:	DOTD Office of Public Works and Hurricane Flood Protection Databases
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly compilation of the database information.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Add the percentage of required hurricane protection system assessment completed; the percentage of new registered water wells that meet construction standards; and the percentage of dam safety inspection completed on schedule and divided by three.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Public Works and Hurricane Flood Protection staff
9. Indicator Limitations:	None

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used to determine the resources required to ensure infrastructure condition and serviceability assessments are completed.
---	---

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.5. Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Needed improvements identified.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The purpose of the MTS Program is to identify navigation issues that hinder commerce on the waterways and support Corps projects that improve marine transportation and stimulate economic development in Louisiana.
3. Indicator Source:	Corps, MARAD, ports, and other stakeholders involved in marine transportation in Louisiana.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	The Corps and commercial sources survey and collect data from shippers and U.S. Customs.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Corps, commercial sources, and DOTD

9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To assess the infrastructure needs of the Louisiana Marine Transportation System.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.5. Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of navigation projects initiated in Louisiana.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Projects identified by the Corps will be the improvement funded by Congress.
3. Indicator Source:	Federal legislation, Water Resources Development Act
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Bi-annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	Simple count of the number of to be funded by the Corps in Louisiana.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Data is collected by the Corps and analyzed by DOTD.
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-	State matching funds will be sought for projects with approved federal funding.

making and Agency processes:	
------------------------------	--

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.5. Develop a Statewide Marine Transportation System (MTS) Program for Louisiana's navigable waterways to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of navigation projects completed in Louisiana.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To improve Louisiana's navigable waterway systems to facilitate economic development and reduce highway congestion.
3. Indicator Source:	The Corps
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a count of the projects completed by the Corps in Louisiana
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Marine and Rail Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Completed Corps projects will determine future projects undertaken by the Corps in Louisiana.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.6. Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Amount of funds for execution of the State Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program to be secured.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Without funds the program cannot be implemented.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of funds will be determined by the Legislature.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually, after the program and the source of funding is approved by the Legislature.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Data on program needs is collected by DOTD Marine and Rail Section and is analyzed and prioritized according to administrative procedures approved by the Legislature.
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To determine the level of funding for rail projects according to priorities established through approved administrative procedures.

Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.6. Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of rail projects that are funded.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine effectiveness.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the data is DOTD and the project sponsors.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	DOTD has approved the scope of work and the project has been let.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Data on project completeness is collected by DOTD.
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	To determine the effectiveness of the Rail Program.



Program: Water Resources and Intermodal Transportation

Objective: 2.1.6. Implement 100% of Statewide Rail Transportation System Program to facilitate economic development and mitigate highway congestion by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Ratio of number of rail projects initiated over the number of projects in rail program.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine the progress of the program
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the data is DOTD and project sponsors
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	The number of projects initiated divided by the projects in the program
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Data on project completeness is collected by DOTD
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To determine the effectiveness of rail programs.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of airports with PCI above 70.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It gives a measure of the general condition of the airports and their ability to carry out their function. Additionally, it gives quantifiable criteria for determining the priority of necessary projects as well as a projection of those needs in the out years. Further, it accommodates a roadmap to meeting the objectives of Vision 2020 and the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System Plan in enhancing the air transportation services at Louisiana airports.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is a study from 1995 which established the baseline for computing the PCI at each airport. Since then, a formula is used to quarterly apply a degradation factor to the baseline number. If improvements are made at an airport, the PCI is increased proportionately based on the area of pavement improved.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly updates are accomplished using the formula provided in the indicator source.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The formula employs a degradation factor of .005 per quarter. This is a standard calculation universally accepted by airport pavement engineers.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	The primary limitation of the indicator is that the baseline study is now old and needs to be re-accomplished. The degradation factor, while fairly accurate, may not take into consideration anomalies in the pavement condition due to erosion, excessive use, weather, etc.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the deterioration to each airport's runways, taxiways, and aprons for purposes of prioritizing project funding.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of airports meeting the state standard for lighting.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator is designed to measure the progress of a five-year plan to bring each airport in the state up to meet a minimum standard for approach, runway, and taxiway lighting.
3. Indicator Source:	A continuous evaluation by the Aviation Section Inspectors, Program Managers, and Staff Aviation Systems Engineering Technician providing input to the tracking systems which maintain the status of each airport's lighting systems. Additionally, airport sponsors provide input to the staff concerning the status of the systems and future requirements. The objective evaluation applied toward each system is extremely reliable and timely.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Collection of data is continuous, with a status report of significant changes presented weekly to the staff and Director. The performance indicator is adjusted and re-evaluated quarterly.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is a simple list of those airports currently meeting the state standard.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	A limitation of the indicator is that it only measures those improvements that cause an airport to meet the state standard, when many improvements are being made that increase the overall quality of airport safety in general, but do not quite meet all the requirements of the state standard.

---

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The data is used to determine funding priorities.
---	---

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of airports who's PCI improved to above 70.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It gives a measure of the general condition of the airports and their abilities to carry out their function. Additionally, it gives quantifiable criteria for determining the priority of necessary projects as well as a projection of those needs in the out years. Furthermore, it accommodates a roadmap to meeting the objectives of Vision 2020 and the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System Plan in enhancing the air transportation services at Louisiana airports.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is a study from 1995 which established the baseline for computing the PCI at each airport. Since then, a formula is used quarterly to apply a degradation factor to the baseline number. If improvements are made at an airport, the PCI is increased proportionately based on the area of pavement improved.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly updates are accomplished using the formula provided in the indicator source.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The formula employs a degradation factor of .005 per quarter. This is a standard calculation universally accepted by airport pavement engineers.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	The primary limitation of the indicator is that the baseline study is now old and needs to be re-accomplished. The degradation factor, while fairly accurate, may not take into consideration anomalies in the pavement condition due to erosion, excessive use, weather, etc.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the deterioration of each airport's runways, taxiways, and aprons for purposes of prioritizing project funding.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of airports improved to meet the state standard for lighting.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator is designed to measure the progress of a five year plan to bring each airport in the state up to meet a minimum standard for approach, runway, and taxiway lighting.
3. Indicator Source:	A continuous evaluation by the Aviation Section Inspectors, Program Managers, and Staff Aviation Systems Engineering Technician provide input to the tracking system which maintains the status of each airport's lighting systems. Additionally, airport sponsors provide input to the staff concerning the status of the systems and future requirements. The objective evaluation applied toward each system is extremely reliable and timely.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Collection of data is continuous, with a status report of significant changes presented weekly to the staff and Director. The performance indicator is adjusted and re-evaluated quarterly.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is a simple addition to the list of those airports meeting the state standard.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	A limitation of the indicator is that it only measures those improvements that cause an airport to meet the state standard, when many improvements are being made that increase the overall quality of airport safety and aviation in general, but do not quite meet all the requirements of the state standard.



10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The data is used to determine funding priorities.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of airports with PCI above 70.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It gives a measure of the general condition of the airports and their ability to carry out their function. Additionally, it gives quantifiable criteria for determining the priority of necessary projects as well as a projection of those needs in the out years. Further, it accommodates a roadmap to meeting the objectives of Vision 2020 and the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System Plan in enhancing the air transportation services at Louisiana airports.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is a study from 1995 which established the baseline for computing the PCI at each airport. Since then, a formula is used quarterly to apply a degradation factor to the baseline number. If improvements are made at an airport, the PCI is increased proportionately based on the area of pavement improved.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly updates are accomplished using the formula provided in the indicator source.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The formula employs a degradation factor of .005 per quarter. This is a standard calculation universally accepted by airport pavement engineers.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	The primary limitation of the indicator is that the baseline study is now old and needs to be re-accomplished. The degradation factor, while fairly accurate, may not take into

	consideration anomalies in the pavement condition due to erosion, excessive use, weather, etc.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the deterioration to each airport's runways, taxiways, and aprons for purposes of prioritizing project funding.

Program: Aviation

Objective: 2.2.1. Improve the aviation safety related infrastructure at 62 public-owned general aviation airports by .5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of airports that were improved to meet the state standard for lighting.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator is designed to measure the progress of a five year plan to bring each airport in the state up to meet a minimum standard for approach, runway and taxiway lighting.
3. Indicator Source:	A continuous evaluation by the Aviation Section Inspectors, Program Managers, and Staff Aviation Systems Engineering Technician provide input to the tracking system which maintains the status of each airport's lighting systems. Additionally, airport sponsors provide input to the staff concerning the status of the systems and future requirements. The objective evaluation applied toward each system is extremely reliable and timely.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Collection of data is continuous, with a status report of significant changes presented weekly to the staff and Director. The performance indicator is adjusted and re-evaluated quarterly.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is a simple addition to the list of those airports meeting the state standard. The number increased is then divided by the total number of public-owned airports to reach the percentage of increase.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Aviation Section

9. Indicator Limitations:	A limitation of the indicator is that it only measures those improvements that cause an airport to meet the state standard, when many improvements are being made that increase the overall quality of airport safety and aviation in general, but do not quite meet all the requirements of the state standard.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The data is used to determine funding priorities.

Program: Public Transportation

Objective: Objective 2.3.1. To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of parishes.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Our mission is to provide mobility for all Louisiana citizens. In addition, Vision 2020 requires every parish to have a transit system.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Public Transportation Section Database. The source is reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The information is developed as part of the Program of Projects submitted annually to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and can be updated quarterly to add “new start” systems upon DOTD/FTA approval of the grant applications from the parish.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the additional number of parishes that use the transportation program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Public transportation means transportation services provided to the general public without regard to geographical location, physical limitation, or economic status.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Public Transportation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the Public Transportation Section’s progress in expanding and/or improving public transportation statewide and will be used to determine if additional resources are needed to achieve Vision 2020 goals.

Program: Public Transportation

Objective: Objective 2.3.1. To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of participating parishes.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Our mission is to provide mobility for all Louisiana citizens. In addition, Vision 2020 requires every parish to have a transit system.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Public Transportation Section Database. The source is reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The information is developed as part of the Program of Projects submitted annually to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and can be updated quarterly to add “new start” systems upon DOTD/FTA approval of the grant applications from the parish.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the total number of parishes that use the transportation program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Public transportation means transportation services provided to the general public without regard to geographical location, physical limitation, or economic status.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Public Transportation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the Public Transportation Section’s progress in expanding and/or improving public transportation statewide and will be used to determine if additional resources are needed to achieve Vision 2020 goals.

Program: Public Transportation

Objective: Objective 2.3.1. To expand the public transportation services that provide low cost public transportation for the rural areas of the state by increasing the number of participating parishes to 50 by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of additional participating parishes.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Our mission is to provide mobility for all Louisiana citizens. In addition, Vision 2020 requires every parish to have a transit system.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Public Transportation Section Database. The source is reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	The information is developed as part of the Program of Projects submitted annually to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and can be updated quarterly to add “new start” systems upon DOTD/FTA approval of the grant applications from the parish.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the additional number of parishes that use the transportation program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Public transportation means transportation services provided to the general public without regard to geographical location, physical limitation, or economic status.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	DOTD Public Transportation Section
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be used to track the Public Transportation Section’s progress in expanding and/or improving public transportation statewide and will be used to determine if additional resources are needed to achieve Vision 2020 goals.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.
9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other

	limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles for National Highway System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide Significance.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles of Regional Highway System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles for Interstate Highway System that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles for National Highway System that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles of Highways of Statewide Significance that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. They are also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Total number of miles of Regional Highway System that have been improved.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the number of miles that have had work to improve the ride-ability condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analysis as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a percentage. The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific calculation of highway dividing the number of total miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	This indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of data and analyses used. Other limiting factors exclude the validity of deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the periods between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement condition within acceptable parameters.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in Interstate Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in National Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in Highways of Statewide Significance in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.1. Effectively maintain and improve the State Highway System so that each year the pavement ride-ability condition quality index for the following percentages of the four classifications of the highways stays in fair or higher condition.

Interstate Highway System – 97% or greater

National Highway System – 95% or greater

Highways of Statewide Significance – 80% or greater

Regional Highway System – 80% or greater

Indicator: Percentage of highway miles in Regional Highway System in fair or higher (greater) condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Reflects the measured or estimated pavement condition.
3. Indicator Source:	Data is measured pavement condition that is collected on a two-year cycle using cameras, sensors, and other truck-mounted equipment by the ARAN truck.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Field data is collected every two years. The pavement condition can be estimated for intermediate years by using deterioration analyses as well as accounting for construction projects that have occurred in the interim between data collection cycles.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by summing the mileage in fair or better condition for each specific classification of highway and dividing that number by the total number of miles of that classification of highway.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Pavement Management Section within the Planning Division is responsible for the collection, quality, and analysis of the field data. It is also responsible for preparing the estimated pavement condition analysis between data collection cycles.

---

9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is entirely dependent on the quality of the data and the analysis used. Other limiting factors include the validity of the deterioration analysis used to predict pavement condition during the period between data collection cycles.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator is used to develop budget requirements for maintaining pavement conditions within acceptable parameters.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.

Indicator: Budget for road projects in TIMED program

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Total budget for road projects in TIMED program.
3. Indicator Source:	The Louisiana TIMED managers maintain the project database. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation of the budgeted funds within TIMED road program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Louisiana TIMED—Transportation Infrastructure Model for Economic Development
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Louisiana TIMED Managers and the Louisiana DOTD Project Managers in Road Design within the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be directly used for management decision-making.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.

Indicator: Budget for bridge projects in TIMED program.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Total budget for bridge projects in TIMED program.
3. Indicator Source:	The Louisiana TIMED managers maintain the project database. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation of the budgeted funds within TIMED bridge program..
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Louisiana TIMED—Transportation Infrastructure Model for Economic Development
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Louisiana TIMED Managers and the Louisiana DOTD Project Managers in Bridge Design within the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be directly used for management decision-making.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.

Indicator: Expenditures for road projects in TIMED program

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The status of expenditures and number of individual project segments determine the progress of the program.
3. Indicator Source:	LA TIMED Program Managers maintain the database of project status. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation of the expenditures for road project .
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Louisiana TIMED—Louisiana Transportation Infrastructure Model for Economic Development
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Louisiana TIMED Managers and the Louisiana DOTD Project Managers in Road Design within the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be directly used for management decision-making.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. : Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.

Indicator: Expenditures for bridge projects in TIMED program.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The status of expenditures and number of individual project segments determine the progress of the program.
3. Indicator Source:	LA TIMED Program Managers maintain the database of project status. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation of the expenditures for bridge projects.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Louisiana TIMED—Louisiana Transportation Infrastructure Model for Economic Development
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Louisiana TIMED Managers and the Louisiana DOTD Project Managers in Bridge Design within the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None

10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be directly used for management decision-making.
---	---

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2. : Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.

Indicator: Overall percent program funds expended for TIMED road projects.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	The status of completion of the overall program determines the progress of the program.
3. Indicator Source:	The Louisiana TIMED managers maintain the database of expenditures and project status. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The status is a simple calculation of the expenditures to date on the overall road program divided by the overall road program budget. The result is converted into a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Louisiana TIMED—Louisiana Transportation Infrastructure Model for Economic Development
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Louisiana TIMED Managers and the DOTD Project Managers in the Office of Engineering (Road Design)
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be directly used for management decision-making.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.2: Implement accelerated TIMED program so that all Road projects are completed by the end of December 2010(with the exception of LA3241); and all bridge projects are completed by the end of December, 2013.

Indicator: Overall percent program funds expended for TIMED bridge projects.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	The status of completion of the overall program determines the progress of the program.
3. Indicator Source:	The Louisiana TIMED managers maintain the database of expenditures and project status. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The status is a simple calculation of the expenditures to date on the overall bridge program divided by the overall bridge budget. The result is converted into a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Louisiana TIMED—Louisiana Transportation Infrastructure Model for Economic Development
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	The Louisiana TIMED Managers and the DOTD Project Managers in the Office of Engineering (Bridge Design)
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will be directly used for management decision-making.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.3. Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete on the state system.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides the population of deficient bridges for which improvements are to be made.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Engineering gathers and maintains this data.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simply tally of the number of bridges not meeting safety and structural integrity standards.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement of commerce/goods.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.3. Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of bridges on the State system.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides the total number of bridges in the state system in order to enable percentage calculations for the number of obsolete/deficient bridges and the percent maintained and/or improved.
3. Indicator Source:	Design and Maintenance Sections track this data
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the number of bridges in the State system.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement of commerce/goods.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.3. Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of bridges that are maintained to meet bridge safety rating requirements.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a basis for which the agency can determine percentage of bridges that are improved to conditions such that they are no longer structurally deficient or obsolete.
3. Indicator Source:	Design and Maintenance Sections track the data.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement of commerce/goods.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.3. Improve the condition and safety of Louisiana's deficient bridges to not more than 23% by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of Louisiana bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides progress information relative to the DOTD's efforts to improve conditions of bridges on the state system.
3. Indicator Source:	Maintenance units maintain this data.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is the number of bridges that are classified as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete divided by the total number of bridges in the state system.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is used for investment decisions, to help reduce the accident rate, and for the movement of commerce/goods.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.4. Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of rest area locations identified in plan.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a baseline figure of the total number of rest areas that required improvement/demolition/ construction.
3. Indicator Source:	Systems Engineering Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Systems Engineering Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used to keep management informed of the progress of the program.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.4. Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of rest area locations removed/improved in accordance with plan.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	This is the total number of rest area locations that have been removed/improved in the fiscal year in accordance with the plan.
3. Indicator Source:	Systems Engineering Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric Tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Systems Engineering Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used to keep management informed of the progress of the program.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.4. Improve Louisiana's public image by completing the Rest Area Improvement Plan by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: A ratio of the number of rest area locations identified in plan and in the number of rest area locations removed/improved in accordance with the plan.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a total percentage completed for the number of rest areas is the program.
3. Indicator Source:	Systems Engineering Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple calculation of the percentage when the number of rest areas improved/removed is divided by the total number of rest areas to be improved/removed in accordance with the program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Systems Engineering Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used to keep management informed of the progress of the program.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.5. Improve the quality of plans and specification in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of addenda, postponements, and change orders recorded quarterly.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Plan quality improvement will result in a greater percentage of plans delivered on time and reduce changes during construction.
3. Indicator Source:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Change Orders – Approved changes to plans during construction
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator relies on accuracy and timeliness of data received from contractors, construction division and contract services.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Provide feedback to Design Section on performance and adds input for consultant rating index.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.5. Improve the quality of plans and specification in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Amount of project cost overrun resulting from change orders.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Plan quality improvement will result in a greater percentage of plans delivered on time and reduce changes during construction.
3. Indicator Source:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Yes Change Orders- Approved changes to plans during construction.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator relies on accuracy and timeliness of data received from contractors, construction division and contract services.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Provide feedback to Design Section on performance and adds input for consultant rating index.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.5. Improve the quality of plans and specification in each area by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of addenda, postponements, and change orders recorded quarterly.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Plan quality improvement will result in a greater percentage of plans delivered on time and reduce changes during construction.
3. Indicator Source:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Percentage
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Yes Change Orders – Approved changes to plans during construction.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Contract Services/Construction Division of the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator relies on accuracy and timeliness of data received from contractors, construction division and contract services.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Provide feedback to Design Section on performance and adds input for consultant rating index.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.6. Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time (PPD) by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of projects included in annual program.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This figure provides the population number for the total projects in the annual program and will be used for comparison purposes to measure progress.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	It is tracked quarterly and reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Project Delivery Date (PDD)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and is used to keep management informed of progress and to provide information for resource allocation decisions.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.6. Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time (PPD) by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of projects delivered on time (by PDD).

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides an indication of the amount of work conducted/completed
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	It is tracked quarterly and reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Project Delivery Date (PDD)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and is used to keep management informed of progress and to provide information for resource allocation decisions.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.6. Increase the percentage of projects delivered on time (PPD) by 5% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of projects delivered on time.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides measure of percentage of projects completed in scheduled timeframe.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	It is tracked quarterly and reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	A standard percentage calculation: the number of projects delivered divided by the number of projects included in annual program.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Project Delivery Date (PDD)
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and is used to keep management informed of progress and to provide information for resource allocation decisions.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.7. Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to estimate issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of projects bid.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides measure of the total number of projects bid so that progress comparison/analyses can be calculated.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Standard count
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and it provides the Administration with information so that quality analyses can be made on all components of the bidding process.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.7. Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to estimate issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of projects requiring rebid.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a measure of the number of bids that have been put out for rebid so that a percentage can be calculated.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Standard count
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and it provides Administration with information necessary for quality analyses and resource allocations for the bidding process.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.7. Reduce the number of projects that must be rebid due to estimate issues by 10% each year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percent of projects that required rebid.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a gauge for estimate quality.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Total number of projects requiring rebid divided by the number of projects bid.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is a dashboard indicator and it provides the Administration with information so that quality analyses can be made on all components of the bidding process.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.8. Reduce expropriations for ownership with clear titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of ownerships with clear titles to be acquired.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a baseline figure for calculation used to measure attempts to reduce expropriations.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Standard count
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This input indicator will provide a baseline to measure reduction in expropriations.



Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.8. Reduce expropriations for ownership with clear titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of ownerships with clear titles acquired.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	This indicator will provide a figure for the number of ownerships with clear titles acquired so that it can be compared to the number of ownerships with clear ownership to be acquired.
3. Indicator Source:	Quarterly
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Standard count
5. Calculation Methodology:	Standard count
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This indicator will be used to monitor progress in the Agency's attempts to reduce expropriations.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.8. Reduce expropriations for ownership with clear titles by 1% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of ownerships with clear titles acquired.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure progress on the Agency's efforts to reduce the number of expropriations for ownerships with clear titles.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Percentage is calculated by dividing the number of ownerships with clear titles by the number of ownerships with clear titles to be acquired.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This indicator monitors progress in the Agency's efforts to reduce the number of expropriations for ownership with clear titles.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.9. Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of annual engineering programs.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	This indicator provides a baseline so that the Agency can monitor programs that fall outside of a 10% range of budget partitions.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Standard count of the number of engineering programs
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This indicator will provide a basis of the number of annual engineering programs against which a comparison can be made to the number of engineering programs that fall outside of a 10% range of the budget partition. Access to this information will allow management to monitor resources and more effectively balance the agency's budget.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.9. Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of annual engineering programs that are outside 10% of the program budget.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides an indicator of the number of engineering programs outside of the budget parameters.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard count of the number of engineering programs that are at least 10% outside of budget partitions.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This provides a figure for Management to compare the number of annual engineering programs to enable Management to make sound decisions regarding resources and prioritizing projects.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.9. Perform quarterly program adjustments to all Office of Engineering programs to keep total program within 10% of budget partitions each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of annual engineering programs outside the 10% of the program budget.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	This indicator will gauge the percentage of engineering programs that fall outside of 10% range of budget partitions.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard percentage calculation: the number of annual engineering programs that are outside 10% of the budget partitions divided by the total number of annual engineering projects.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This is used to inform internal and external stakeholders of the Agency's success in maintaining engineering programs within a 10% range of the budget partitions.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.10. Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Project bid costs.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a figure against which project construction costs can be compared.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Summation of bid costs
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This information will enable the Agency Administration to gauge bid quality/efficiency, construction costs/efficiency, and make more-informed decisions regarding agency resources.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.10 Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Project construction costs.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	This provides a comparison figure to be used against bid costs.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Summation of costs on construction projects
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This information will enable the Agency Administration to gauge bid quality/efficiency, construction costs/efficiency, and make more-informed decisions regarding agency resources.

Program: Office of Engineering

Objective: 3.1.10. Maintain construction projects final fiscal cost with 110% (+ -) of original bid each year through June 30, 2013

Indicator: Project construction costs as a ratio to project bid costs.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides a measure of the ratio of project construction costs to project bid costs
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering database
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard percentage calculation: project construction costs divided by project bid costs.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This information will enable the Agency Administration to gauge bid quality/efficiency, construction costs/efficiency, and make more-informed decisions regarding agency resources.



Program: Bridge Trust

Objective: 3.2.1. To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintaining a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total operating costs.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the bridge-related operating costs.
3. Indicator Source:	The plaza transaction summary report and budget status report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is the total operating cost for the facility including personnel, supplies, contracted services, debt payments, and major repairs.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The plaza transaction summary report only records transactions in one direction, therefore, to produce an accurate number of transactions we must multiply the transactions by two.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Accounting and Toll Departments
9. Indicator Limitations:	Limitations are in the manual entry of coding expenditures which could result in errors in the total operating expenditures.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used in determining whether the amounts of tolls charged per vehicle are adequate for maintenance of the bridge.

Program: Bridge Trust

Objective: 3.2.1. To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintaining a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of vehicles that use the facility.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the number of vehicles that use the facility.
3. Indicator Source:	The plaza transaction summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the total number of vehicles that use the facility during a certain period.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The plaza transaction summary report only records transactions in one direction; therefore, to produce an accurate number of transactions we must multiply the transactions by two.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Accounting and Toll Departments
9. Indicator Limitations:	Input equipment failure can result in fewer vehicles being recorded than how many actually crossed the bridge.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used in determining whether the amounts of tolls charged per vehicle are adequate for maintenance of the bridge.

Program: Bridge Trust

Objective: 3.2.1. To optimize bridge-related operations cost by maintaining a cost per vehicle of \$0.30 or less by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total operating cost per vehicle that uses the facility.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the total operating cost per vehicle, which indicates the efficiency of the operation.
3. Indicator Source:	The plaza transaction summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple calculation of the total operating cost divided by the number of vehicles that use the facility during a certain period.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The plaza transaction summary report only records transactions in one direction; therefore, to produce an accurate number of transactions we must multiply by 2.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Accounting and Toll departments
9. Indicator Limitations:	Input equipment failure can result in fewer vehicles being recorded than those that actually crossed the bridge.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used in determining whether the amounts of tolls charged per vehicle are adequate for maintenance of the bridge.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.1. To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by 6% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads from the previous year.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine the values of the required variables for calculating the percent reduction in number of fatalities.
3. Indicator Source:	The source for this indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section and the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The annual number of fatalities is a simple count of the fatalities occurring in one year. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation is the lag between actual fatality occurrences and official published documentation.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The number of fatalities can be categorized, such as the number of roadway departure fatalities, to help determine where to place the greatest emphasis for safety campaigns and improvements. The total number will be used to calculate the percent reduction when compared with the total from the previous year.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.1. To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by 6% each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Annual number of fatalities from motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana public roads from the current year.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine the values of the required variables for calculating the percent reduction in number of fatalities.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database. The source is very reliable
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annually
5. Calculation Methodology:	The annual number of fatalities is a simple count of the fatalities occurring in one year. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation is the lag between actual fatality occurrences and official published documentation
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The number of fatalities can be categorized, such as the number of roadway departure fatalities, to help determine where to place the greatest emphasis for safety campaigns and improvements. The total number will be used to calculate the percent reduction when compared with the total from the previous year.



Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.1. To reduce the number of fatalities on Louisiana public roads by six percent each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percent reduction in annual number of traffic crash fatalities compared with the previous year.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure progress in reducing the number of traffic crash fatalities in Louisiana.
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator source is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section and the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The previous year's number of fatalities is subtracted from the current year's number of fatalities divided by the previous year's fatalities then multiplied by 100 to equal the percent change. This is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation is the lag between actual fatality occurrences and the official published documents.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The outcome indicator will be used to monitor progress in reducing the number of traffic crash fatalities in Louisiana and in the allocation of the available construction budget among safety and other types of projects.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.2. To achieve at least a 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Pre-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish before and after crash performance at individual safety improvement project locations.
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator source is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The pre-improvement and post-improvement crash rates are each based on three years of crash data. The crash rate is the number of crashes divided by the miles driven (in millions) within the project limits over a three-year period. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation of the indicator is that three years must elapse after the safety improvement in order to determine post-improvement crash performance.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-	The input indicator can be used to establish before and after crash rates for individual



making and Agency processes:	safety improvement measures.
------------------------------	------------------------------

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.2. To achieve at least a 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Post-improvement crash rates for individual safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish before and after crash performance at individual safety improvement project locations.
3. Indicator Source:	The indicator source is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The pre-improvement and post-improvement crash rates are each based on three years of crash data. The crash rate is the number of crashes divided by the miles driven (in millions) within the project limits over a three-year period. It is a standard calculation
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator can be used to establish before and after crash rates for individual safety improvement measures.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.2. To achieve at least a 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percent reduction in crash rates at individual safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish the percent reduction in crash rates at individual safety improvement project locations in order to calculate the average reduction for all project locations.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The pre-crash rate is subtracted from the post-crash rate and then divided by the pre-crash rate and multiplied by 100 to equal the percent change. It is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The crash rate is the number of crashes per 1 million miles driven and is the standard calculation used by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and throughout the engineering profession.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator's limitation is that three years must elapse after the safety improvement in order to determine post-improvement crash rates.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The output indicator will be used to measure the effectiveness of different types of safety improvement measures.



Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.2. To achieve at least a 25% reduction in fatal and non-fatal crash rates at selected abnormal crash locations through the implementation of safety improvements through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Average percent reduction in crash rates for all safety improvement project locations.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To determine the effectiveness of highway safety improvement projects.
3. Indicator Source:	The source of the indicator is the Office of Planning and Programming Highway Safety Section, the Louisiana Traffic Crash Database, and the safety improvement project records. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Results are reported annually.
5. Calculation Methodology:	The indicator is calculated by dividing the summation of the output data by the number of safety improvement projects.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	The crash rate is the number of crashes per 1 million miles driven and is the standard calculation used by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and throughout the engineering profession.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator's limitation is that three years must elapse after the safety improvement in order to determine post-improvement crash rates.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The output indicator will be used for capital funding allocation and for the selection of safety improvement measures at individual sites.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.3. Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of elements of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation System.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To establish a baseline from which progress can be measured.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Planning and Programming; the source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The plan was reviewed to identify distinct elements. It is a simple count of the total number of elements.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	A plan element refers to distinct recommendations concerning policies, programs, or projects.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary of the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator will provide a baseline for measuring the progress on the Plan.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.3. Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current year.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To track the progress implementation of individual plan elements.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Planning and Programming
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of plan elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded).
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The outcome indicator will be used to monitor implementation progress of the entire plan.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.3. Implement 10% of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percent of elements in the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current year.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure progress on the implementation of the Louisiana Statewide Transportation Plan.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming maintains records on plan implementation. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The outcome is a simple percentage obtained by dividing the number of plan elements implemented (i.e., completed or fully funded) in the current fiscal year by the total number of plan elements and multiplying by 100.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Plan element refers to distinct recommendations concerning policies, programs, or projects.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Indicator will be used to monitor progress on the overall implantation of the Plan.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.4. To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total miles of Interstate Highway System classified as urban.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides the denominator for calculating the percentage of uncongested roads in the urban Interstate Highway System.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming maintains a comprehensive inventory of highway facilities. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple summation of the total urban Interstate Highway miles on the system.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	This input indicator will not be directly used for management decision-making.



Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.4. To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Miles of the urban Interstate Highway System that are in an uncongested condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Traffic volumes and capacity are the national standard inputs for computing congestion – Highway Capacity Manual.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming maintains traffic volume and highway inventory databases. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	Traffic volumes are recorded at 5,000 locations statewide on a three year cycle. The capacity of individual roadway sections is calculated using standard methods, the Highway Capacity Manual. Congestion is determined by comparing the volume to capacity ratio to threshold values.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator will not be directly used for management decision-making.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.4. To maintain 80% or greater of the urban Interstate Highway System in uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percent of the urban Interstate Highway System in an uncongested condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Under § L.R.S. 48:228, the department is required to conduct a continuing needs study. The outcome indicator monitors congestion on a critical component of the highway network.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming conducts congestion analyses on the highway system. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The uncongested miles are divided by the total miles to determine the percent. This is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Congestion is determined by comparing the volume to capacity ratio to threshold values.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The outcome indicator is used to monitor congestion on the urban Interstate Highway System and to allocate capital resources.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.5. To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total miles of National Highway System classified as urban.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Provides the denominator for calculating the percentage uncongested
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming maintains a comprehensive inventory of highway facilities. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple summation of the total miles on the National Highway System within urban areas.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator will not be directly used for management decision-making.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.5. To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Miles of urban National Highway System that are in an uncongested condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	Traffic volumes and capacity are the national standard inputs for computing congestion – Highway Capacity Manual.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming maintains traffic volume and highway inventory databases. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	Traffic volumes are recorded at 5,000 locations statewide on a three year cycle. The capacity of individual roadway sections is calculated using standard methods, the Highway Capacity Manual. Congestion is determined by comparing the volume to capacity ratio to threshold values.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The input indicator will not be directly used for management decision-making.

Program: Planning and Programming

Objective: 3.3.5. To maintain 65% or greater of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percent of the urban National Highway System in an uncongested condition.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	Under § L.R.S. 48:228, the department is required to conduct a continuing needs study. The outcome indicator monitors congestion on a critical component of the highway network.
3. Indicator Source:	The Office of Planning and Programming conducts congestion analyses on the highway system. The source is very reliable.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Annual
5. Calculation Methodology:	The uncongested miles are divided by the total miles to determine the percent. This is a standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Congestion is determined by comparing the volume to capacity ratio to threshold values.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Deputy Secretary for the Office of Planning and Programming
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	The outcome indicator is used to monitor congestion on the urban National Highway System and to allocate capital resources.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.1. Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of new/modified traffic signal requests during the fiscal year.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is an indication of the number of signals that were requested within one fiscal year.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the District and Traffic Sections within the Office of Operations.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is the number of new and/or modified traffic signals that were requested to be put into operation within one fiscal year.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Traffic Operations Section within the Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will provide management with an indication of the responsiveness of the Traffic Operations Section within the Office of Operation and for the funding level.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.1. Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of new/modified traffic signals completed and operational in less than six months each fiscal year.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is an indication of the total number of signals that were put into operation during the year.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the Traffic Operations Section within the Office of Operations.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is the totally number of new and/or improved traffic signals that have been made operational during the fiscal year.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Traffic Operations Section within the Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	There are two entities (District Operations and Traffic) involved in accomplishing this task.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will provide management with the aggregate totals and responsiveness of Traffic and District Operations within the Office of Operations as well as funding prioritization.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.1. Improve safety by reducing the overall average time it takes to study, design, and install new and/or modified traffic signals to less than six months each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of new traffic signal installations/modifications completed and operational during the fiscal year that were done within six months from the date the request was made to the date operational.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is an indication of the amount of backlog.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the Traffic Operations Section within the Office of Operations.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation whereby the number of traffic signals that were put into operation within one year of the request is divided by the total number of traffic signals completed during the year. The result is then converted into a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Traffic Operations Section within the Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	It does not clearly distinguish between district and traffic operations functions.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will provide management with an aggregate total and responsiveness of Traffic and District Operations within the Office of Operations and funding prioritization.



Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.2. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of projects to be implemented.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	To meet requirements.
3. Indicator Source:	Total number of projects to be implemented as developed by Director.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Summary total of projects.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Emergency Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation on this indicator is if no actual events occur. In this case, an after action review will not be needed. This is in reference to Strategies 3.4.2.5 and 3.4.2.7.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will help management identify equipment and personnel needs. It will also determine the need for program enhancements and identify necessary changes in work flow or work processes.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.2. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of projects implemented

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To meet requirements, ensure that established federal and state standards are met, and that all performance requirements meet designated timelines.
3. Indicator Source:	Reports generated on a schedule determined by the director of the program.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Summary of plans implemented
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Emergency Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation on this indicator is if no actual events occur. In this case, an after action review will not be needed. This is in reference to Strategies 3.4.2.5 and 3.4.2.7.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will help management identify equipment and personnel needs. It will also determine the need for program enhancements and identify necessary changes in work flow or work processes.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.2. Implement a comprehensive emergency management program within DOTD which supports the state's emergency operations and DOTD's assigned responsibilities by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of projects implemented each fiscal year.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To meet requirements, ensure federal and state standards are met, and that all performance requirements meet designated timelines.
3. Indicator Source:	Reports are generated on a schedule determined by the Director of the program.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Numeric tally of calculation
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Director of Emergency Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitation on this indicator is if no actual events occur. In this case, an after action review will not be needed. This is in reference to Strategies 3.4.2.5 and 3.4.2.7.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator will help management identify equipment and personnel needs. It will also determine the need for program enhancements and identify necessary changes in work flow or work processes.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.3. To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of ITS projects/plan.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the level of incident management and ITS systems that are being deployed and operated on the State's freeway and major highway networks.
3. Indicator Source:	ITS Section
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the number of ITS projects in the overall plan.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	ITS—Intelligent Transportation Systems
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Disaggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	ITS Unit of Traffic Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	It does not measure the effectiveness of the ITS systems based on the reduction of traffic demand.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used to prioritize funding of the ITS and TMC (Traffic Management Center) program budget partitions.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.3. To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Number of ITS/TMC projects implemented and fully deployed.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the level of incident management and ITS systems that are being deployed and operated on the State's freeway and major highway networks.
3. Indicator Source:	ITS Section
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple count of the number of ITS projects that are implemented.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	ITS—Intelligent Transportation Systems
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	ITS Unit of Traffic Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitations of this indicator do not measure the effectiveness of the ITS systems based on reductions of traffic demand.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	It will be used to prioritize funding of the ITS and TIM program budget partitions.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.3. To fully deploy the statewide incident management plan by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of implementation of all projects within the program.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the level of incident management and ITS systems that are being deployed and operated on the State's freeway and major highway networks.
3. Indicator Source:	ITS Section
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a simple calculation whereby the number of implemented ITS projects is divided by the number of ITS projects in the overall plan. The result is converted into a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	ITS—Intelligent Transportation Systems
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	ITS Unit of Traffic Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitations of this indicator do not measure the effectiveness of the ITS systems based on reductions of traffic demand.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used to prioritize funding of the ITS and TIM program budget partitions.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.4. To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total miles of Interstate roadways.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a total number of Interstate roadways in the state.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the number of miles of Interstate roadways in the state.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management will use the indicator as a basis to measure performance and prioritize funding.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.4. To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total miles of Interstate roadway that pavement markings meet or exceed performance requirements.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is a total of Interstate roadways in the state that meet or exceed performance requirements.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the number of miles of Interstate roadways in the state that meet or exceed performance requirements.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator limitation is funding.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management will use the indicator as a basis for measuring performance and allocating funds.



Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.4. To improve safety by developing and implementing a pavement marking program to assure that 90% of all Interstate roadways meet or exceed performance expectations by June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of Interstate roadways that meet or exceed performance specifications for roadway markings.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the percentage of Interstate roadways that meet or exceed performance for pavement markings.
3. Indicator Source:	Office of Engineering
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The total interstate roadway miles that meet or exceed performance specifications for markings is divided by the total number of interstate roadway miles in the state. The result is converted into a percentage.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Traffic Operations within the Office of Engineering
9. Indicator Limitations:	The indicator is limited by funding, weather, and an adequate workforce.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	Management will use the indicator as a basis for the allocation of funds.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.5 To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-striped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total line miles that are deficient.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	It is the total number of non interstate line miles that are deficient on roadways in the state, excluding the Interstate.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the District Traffic Sections.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the number of non-interstate line miles that are measured to be deficient.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Office of Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	None
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To measure current status of painted non-interstate line miles.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.5. To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-stripped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total line miles that are re-stripped.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure the total non-interstate line miles that have been re-stripped.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the District Traffic Sections.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the total non-interstate line miles that have been re-stripped.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	District Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The objective is influenced by external factors such as funding, equipment, weather, etc.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	To measure performance and prioritize funding.

Program: District Operations

Objective: 3.4.5. To improve safety by ensuring that 100% of deficient non-interstate line miles are re-stripped by the end of each fiscal year through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of deficient line miles that have been re-stripped.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	To measure the percentage of deficient non-interstate line miles that have been re-stripped.
3. Indicator Source:	The data is maintained by the District Traffic Sections.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a summary of the total non-interstate line miles that have been re-stripped versus the total that are deficient.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	District Operations
9. Indicator Limitations:	The objective is influenced by external factors such as funding, equipment, weather, etc.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	To measure performance and prioritizing funding.

Program: Marine Operation

Objective: 3.5.1. To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of scheduled crossings during a period.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	Represents the number of crossings that were scheduled during operating hours for a given reporting period.
3. Indicator Source:	The monthly vessel count summary report
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The standard calculation is created from adding the total number of scheduled crossings.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District
9. Indicator Limitations:	The information is gathered manually, human error, and the transposition of numbers during the data entry stage are all limitations to this indicator.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is an instrument for the allocation of funds. It illustrates the effectiveness and efficiency of the program. It is a direct reflection of our preventive maintenance efforts.

Program: Marine Operations

Objective: 3.5.1. To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Total number of actual crossings during a period.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the number of crossing that were made during operating hours during in a given reporting period.
3. Indicator Source:	The monthly vessel count summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The standard calculation is created by adding the total number of scheduled crossings minus the total number of actual crossings.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District
9. Indicator Limitations:	Information is gathered manually, human error, and the transposition of numbers during data entry are all limitations of this indicator.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It is primarily an instrument for the allocation of funds. It illustrates the effectiveness and efficiency of the program. It is a direct reflection of our preventive maintenance efforts.

Program: Marine Operations

Objective: 3.5.1. To maintain ferries to ensure downtime during scheduled operating hours does not exceed 5% each FY through June 30, 2013.

Indicator: Percentage of actual crossings during a given period.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It represents the percentage of crossings that were not made during operating hours for a given reporting period.
3. Indicator Source:	The monthly vessel count summary report
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	Dividing the total number of crossings not made due to operational downtime by the total scheduled crossings for a period creates the standard calculation.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District.
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitations to this indicator include the manually gathering of information, human error, and the transposition of numbers during data entry.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes.	It is primarily an instrument for the allocation of funds. It illustrates the effectiveness and efficiency of the program. It is a direct reflection of our preventive maintenance efforts.

Program: Marine Operations

Objective: 3.5.2. To maintain ferry-related operations at a passenger cost of not more than \$3.50 per passenger.

Indicator: Total ferry operating costs for a previous period.

1. Indicator Type:	Input
2. Indicator Rationale:	The indicator represents the actual ferry operating cost for a reporting period. It highlights the effectiveness and efficiency of the ferry's operations.
3. Indicator Source:	The budget status report and the monthly vessel count summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation by summarizing the total amount of actual expenditures for the period.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Operating costs include personnel, supplies, fuel, contracted services, major repairs, and equipment replacement.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District
9. Indicator Limitations:	The information is gathered manually, human error, and transposition of numbers during data entry are all limitations to this indicator.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	It will be used for budgetary purposes for proper allocation of funds. It will also determine the need for additional vessels.



Program: Marine Operations

Objective: 3.5.2. To efficiently manage ferry-related operations so that the bridge toll operating subsidy is less than \$3.50 per passenger.

Indicator: Total number of passengers for a period.

1. Indicator Type:	Output
2. Indicator Rationale:	It represents the actual number of passengers that used the ferry for a reporting period. It highlights the effectiveness and efficiency of the ferry's operations.
3. Indicator Source:	The budget status report and the monthly vessel count summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	The total number of passengers is derived by taking the total number of vehicles multiplied by 1.4 and adding it to the total number of pedestrians.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	None
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District
9. Indicator Limitations:	The limitations for this indicator include the transposition of numbers during data entry, human error, and the manual gathering of the information.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator can be used for budgetary purposes for the allocation of funds. It also determines the need for additional vessels.

Program: Marine Operations

Objective: 3.5.2. To efficiently manage ferry-related operations so that the bridge toll operating subsidy is less than \$3.50 per passenger.

Indicator: Total ferry operating costs for a previous period.

1. Indicator Type:	Outcome
2. Indicator Rationale:	It represents the actual ferry operating costs for a reporting period. It highlights the effectiveness and efficiency of the ferry's operations.
3. Indicator Source:	The budget status report and the monthly vessel count summary report.
4. Frequency and Timing of Collection and/or Reporting:	Quarterly
5. Calculation Methodology:	It is a standard calculation by taking the total amount of actual expenditures divided by the total number of passengers.
6. Definition of Unclear Terms:	Operating costs include personnel, supplies, fuel, contracted services, major repairs, and equipment replacement.
7. Aggregate/Disaggregate Figure:	Aggregate
8. Responsible party for data collection, analysis, and quality:	Marine Operations and the accounting department of the Crescent City Connection District
9. Indicator Limitations:	Manually gathered information, transposition of numbers during data entry, and human error can all be limitations to this indicator.
10. Indicator use in Management decision-making and Agency processes:	The indicator can be used for budgetary purposes for the allocation of funds. It also determines the need for additional vessels.

**Department of Transportation and Development**

**APPENDIX F**

**Strategy Checklist Documentation**

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
ADMINISTRATION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**Strategy: 1.1.1.1. Establish, disseminate, and implement agency communication plan to improve customer satisfaction.**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
ADMINISTRATION  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

**Strategy:** 1.2.1.1. Provide management with tools/systems to attract a qualified and diverse pool of applicants.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**ADMINISTRATION**  
**OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

**Strategy:** 1.2.1.2. Establish HR programs/policies to motivate employees to achieve high performance levels.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**ADMINISTRATION**  
**OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

**Strategy:** 1.2.1.3. Provide training opportunities that are specifically directed to improving the skill level.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**ADMINISTRATION**  
**OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

**Strategy:** 1.2.1.4. Implement a workforce succession plan.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☐ Authorization Exists  
☒ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☐ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☐ Already Ongoing  
☒ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
ADMINISTRATION  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

**Strategy:** 1.2.1.5. Increase the number of internships available for engineering students.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**ADMINISTRATION**  
**OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

**Strategy:** 1.2.1.6. Partner with local colleges and universities for co-op students and/or interns in disciplines other than engineering, i.e., accountants, auditors, human resources, computer science.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**ADMINISTRATION**  
**OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

**Strategy:** 1.2.2.1. Identify opportunities for cost-effective reductions of administrative expenses.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.1.1. Use state funds as cost share for Port Construction and Development Priority Program projects that will provide to the state at least five times the state's investment.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.2.1. Use state funds as cost share match for Federal Corps of Engineers flood control projects that will provide at least seven times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.1.2.2. Use state funds as cost share for statewide flood control projects that will provide at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.2.3. Use state funds as cost share for Hurricane Priority Program projects that will provide at least three times the state's investment in flood damage reduction benefits.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.3. Promote activities and projects eligible for CRS.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.4.1. Perform hurricane flood protection system assessment inspections (levees, floodwalls, pump stations, and drainage structures).	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.4.2. Perform the scheduled dam safety inspections.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.4.3. Perform the required water well inspections.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.5.1. Assess the needs and determine the priorities for improving Louisiana's navigable waterways system by December 31 of each year.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.5.2. Identify sources of state funding for waterways projects and submit appropriate legislation by March 31, 2009.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.5.3. Seek funding for projects of importance to Louisiana by March 31 of each year.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.5.4. Partner with the Corps, port authorities, MPOs, and other stakeholders to complete navigation projects.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.6.1. Secure annual funding to execute the Statewide Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program by June 30, 2010.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.6.2. Develop and obtain legislative approval of administrative procedures and guidelines for the Rail Program by June 30, 2010.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.6.3. Present a prioritized list of rail projects to the Legislature for approval by June 30 of each year after the approval and funding of the Statewide Rail Infrastructure Improvement Program.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>WATER RESOURCES AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.1.6.4. Implement rail project approval and funded by the Legislature by June 30 of the year following the project's selection.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**AVIATION**

**Strategy:** 2.2.1.1. Improve the condition of runways, taxiways, and aprons.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**AVIATION**

**Strategy:** 2.2.1.2. Improve airport lighting.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.3.1.1. Maximize coordination efforts to minimize trip cost and optimize the use of automation in compiling transit statistics

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.3.1.2. Survey agencies to determine additional needs.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.3.1.3. Update inventory and condition of FTA funded vehicles in the fleet.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.3.1.4. Develop and conduct workshops to train agencies.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.3.1.5. Develop and monitor vehicle use and maintenance reports. Conduct site reviews to determine agency compliance with FTA regulations and provide feedback.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST</b> <b>OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION</b> <b>PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b> 2.3.1.6. Develop a funding plan that includes local or state (non-federal) revenues to facilitate expansion of the public transportation program into two (2) additional parishes per year.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF PUBLIC WORKS, HURRICANE FLOOD PROTECTION, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION**  
**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

**Strategy:** 2.3.1.7. Identify funding sources to provide one-half of the match of the federal dollars to operate a transit system.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.1. Determine the most current “measured” percentage in less than fair condition.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.2. Present ride-ability data to management in graphic and tabular format.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.3. In interim years, calculate P.I. by extrapolation of available data.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.4. Recommend an appropriate budget-based upon the latest known percentage so that the objective remains on target.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.5. Compare needs to current budget partition and recommend budget revisions if necessary.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.6. Review program pavement rehabilitation projects annually to achieve objective.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.7. Review Pavement Management System (PMS) recommended projects with Headquarters Pavement Program Manager to obtain initial input.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.1.8. Review recommended projects with teams to select projects and develop letting program.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.2.1. Perform program feasibility analyses annually.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.2.2. Continue Public Outreach Program.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.2.3. Initiate design contracts with consultants and sub-contractors.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.2.4. Acquire required right-of-way.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.2.5. Obtain utility relocations agreements.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☒ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.2.6. Obtain required permits from regulatory agencies.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.3.1. Complete development of Bridge Management System.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.3.2. Maintain Annual Statewide Bridge Preservation Program.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.3.3. Establish Bridge Preservation Program.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.4.1. Complete two rest areas per calendar year.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☒ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.4.2. Develop a statewide program for rest area renovations and replacements.

☒ Analysis

☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☒ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.4.3. Develop a prototype for rest areas to be used statewide.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.4.4. Continue environment clearance and design.

☒ Analysis

- ☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☒ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.4.5. Reconstruct existing rest areas where necessary.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.4.5. Construct new rest areas where necessary.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.5.1. Tracking of addenda/postponements.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.5.2. Tracking of change orders.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.5.3. Evaluate accuracy of change order coding.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.5.4. Conduct regular periodic meetings for plan review.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.5.5. Tracking of financial impacts associated with change orders.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.6.1. Maintain Program and Project Management System (PPMS).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.6.1. Ensure that project managers are Project Management (PM) certified through Project Management Institute (PMI).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.6.3. Require executive level approval for changing or modifying percentage of projects delivered project delivery date (PDD).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.7.1. Develop and conduct estimating training for project managers.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☐ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☐ Already Ongoing  
☒ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.7.2. Fully staff Estimates and Valuing Engineering positions.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.7.3. Require timely update of project estimates.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.8.1. Delivery of Right-of-Way maps to Real Estate sections as soon as possible.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.8.2. Provide early notification of project to community or other interested parties.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.8.3. Conduct public awareness campaigns.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.9.1. Conduct monthly program review with each program manger.

☒ Analysis

☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.9.2. Interface with DOTD Subcommittee on Finance.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.9.3. Adjust projects included in annual budge partition.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.10.1 Establish and maintain database of final closeout cost of Tracking of Project Systems (TOPS) or comparable mainframe system.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING**

**Strategy:** 3.1.10.2. Ensure that Project Engineers maintain scope of project to maintain budget.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☒ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☒ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**BRIDGE TRUST**

**Strategy:** 3.2.1.1. Analyze needs and necessary funding for upgrade to working environment, facilities, and equipment.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resources Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.1. Implement the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) through a collaborative partnership with highway safety stakeholders such that the priorities, programs, and projects of each support the emphasis areas identified in the SHSP.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.2. Improve the system utilized to track roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.3. Identify crash locations and corridors involving roadway departures fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.4. Develop countermeasures to reduce roadway departure fatalities, intersection-related fatalities, pedestrian fatalities, railroad crossing fatalities, and work-zone fatalities.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.5. Program a minimum of \$20 million in highway safety construction projects each fiscal year including countermeasures to reduce roadway departures, improve intersections, and improve pedestrian safety.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.6. Manage the Department's annual Highway Safety Program.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.7. Program a minimum of \$8 million of highway-rail grade crossing safety improvement projects each fiscal year.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☒ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.8. Manage the Department's annual Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Safety Program.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.9. Implement the recommendations from the Work Zone Safety Task Force Report.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.10. Provide Work Zone Training classes to DOTD/Contractor/Consultant personnel.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.11. Develop a public information program for National Work Zone Awareness Week each fiscal year.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.12. Work cooperatively and in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Louisiana Highway Safety Commission (LHSC), Louisiana State Police (LSP), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to develop and promote traffic safety programs involving engineering, education, and enforcement.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.13. Develop, implement, and fund statewide traffic safety public information/education/awareness campaigns.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.14. Improve the quality of traffic crash data.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.15. Develop and implement the Safe Routes to Schools and Local Road Safety Programs as per SAFETEA-LU.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.1.16. Track and report all fatal motor vehicle crashes on Louisiana's public road system to NHTSA by administering the Fatality Analysis and Reporting System (FARS).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.2.1. Identify abnormal crash locations annually.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.2.2. Provide abnormal crash locations to DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers for annual study.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.2.3. Review annual recommendations from DOTD District Traffic Operations Engineers.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.2.4. Prioritize projects based on the greatest safety benefit.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.2.5. Recommend highway safety improvement projects to the Headquarters Highway Safety Project Selection Team for inclusion in the Department's Annual Highway Safety Program.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.2.6. Conduct evaluation studies to determine program effectiveness.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.3.1. Establish an internal DOTD Implementation Steering Committee.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.3.2. Continue public awareness/education efforts.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.3.3. Seek funding from traditional and non-traditional sources.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.4.1. Maximize number of miles of congested highways to be improved.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.4.2. Submit congestion-relief projects for innovative funding.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☒ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.4.3. Define minimum state requirements for local growth management policies.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.5.1. Maximize number of miles of congested highways to be improved.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.5.2. Submit congestion-relief projects for innovative funding.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.5.3. Define minimum State requirements for local growth management policies.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.5.4. Develop and maintain a statewide access management policy.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING**

**Strategy:** 3.3.5.5. Maintain the policy on traffic impact analyses for proposed developments.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.1.1. Reduce equipment downtime.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.1.2. Establish and equip one additional crew for signal installation

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☐ Already Ongoing  
☒ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.1.3. Expedite the study and design process.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.1. Increase staffing for program management.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.2. Review and update the DOTD Emergency Operations Plan and Emergency Support Function (ESF) Plans by May 31<sup>st</sup> each year.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.3. Provide training for all personnel assigned an emergency position (IS-100, IS-700 NIMS, position specific training).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.4. Participate in local, state, and federal exercises.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.5. Conduct an after action review following an actual event within two (2) weeks after response ends.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.6. Conduct an after action review following a scheduled exercise within one (1) week of completion of the exercise.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.7. Execution of plans for the protection of life and property in response to emergencies/disasters.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.8. Properly document emergency response, emergency repairs, and permanent work to facilitate reimbursement.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.2.9. Protection of critical transportation infrastructure against threats.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.3.1. Develop and implement Advanced Traffic Management System (ATMS) in metropolitan areas of New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Shreveport/Bossier City, Lafayette, Monroe, Houma, Lake Charles, and Alexandria.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.3.2. Establish regional, district, and statewide traffic management centers (TMCs).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.3.3. Implement and operate Motorist Assistance Program (MAP) on critical roadways.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.3.4. Update statewide ITS and TIM Plans.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.3.5. Update and enhance the statewide Advanced Traveler Information System (ATIS).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.3.6. Update and Enhance the Louisiana Commercial Vehicle Information System and Network (CVISN).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.4.1. Identify and establish permanent, recurring funding source maximizing use of federal funds for pavement marking program.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.4.2. Develop performance-based specification for pavement markings.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.4.3. Create pavement marking database to track material readings.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.4.4. Develop plans for Interstate maintenance jobs.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.4.5. Monitor segments which fail to meet minimum requirements and warranties.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST  
OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS  
DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.4.6. Re-evaluate and refine pavement marking replacement program.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

<b>Strategy:</b> 3.4.5.1. Reduce equipment downtime.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**DISTRICT OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.4.5.2. Develop and implement a district-wide plan.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Analysis Used <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Other Strategies Considered
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorization Exists <input type="checkbox"/> Authorization Needed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Organizational Capacity	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Resource Needs Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Time Frame	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Already Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> New Startup Date Estimated <input type="checkbox"/> Lifetime of Strategy Identified
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fiscal Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Impact on Operating Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Impact on Capital Outlay <input type="checkbox"/> Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.1.1. Conduct a more effective maintenance program.

☒ Analysis

- ☒ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☒ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.1.2. Maintain and recondition ferry equipment to extend life.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.1.3. Determine if new or different types of equipment would improve operations.

☒ Analysis

☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

☐ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☒ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

☐ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.1.4. Prepare a list of equipment needs.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.1.5. Request funding for equipment needs.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified



**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.1.6. Train personnel in the use and care of all equipment.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☐ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.2.1. Analyze needs and necessary funding for upgrade to working environment, facilities, and equipment.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☒ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☒ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.2.2. Maintain and recondition equipment to extend equipment life.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.2.3. Determine if new or different types of equipment would improve operations.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.2.4. Prepare list of equipment and facility needs.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.2.5. Seek required funding.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified

**STRATEGY ANALYSIS CHECKLIST**  
**OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS**  
**MARINE OPERATIONS**

**Strategy:** 3.5.2.6. Purchase/construct/renovate equipment and facilities.

☒ Analysis

- ☐ Cost Benefit Analysis Conducted  
☒ Other Analysis Used  
☐ Impact on Other Strategies Considered

☒ Authorization

- ☒ Authorization Exists  
☐ Authorization Needed

☒ Organizational Capacity

- ☐ Needed Structural or Procedural Change(s) Identified  
☒ Resource Needs Identified

☒ Time Frame

- ☒ Already Ongoing  
☐ New Startup Date Estimated  
☐ Lifetime of Strategy Identified

☒ Fiscal Impact

- ☒ Impact on Operating Budget  
☐ Impact on Capital Outlay  
☐ Means of Finance Identified